

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1889.

## The Week.

THE President's Attorney-General was unfortunate, to say the least, in stating the reasons for the removal of Elliott Sandford, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Utah. Judge Sandford was informed on May 10 by the Attorney-General, that the President would be pleased to receive his resignation, since in the President's opinion the "public interest would be subserved by a change in the office." The Judge replied by asking whether he had been accused of misconduct or malversation in office, and saying that if charges had been preferred against him, it "would be unwise, unbecoming, and improper" for him to resign until they were either proved or disproved. In response to this inquiry, the Judge received from the Attorney-General a letter of which the following is the main portion. We quote from the *Times*, which reproduces the full correspondence:

"I beg to say that there are on file in this department some papers complaining of the manner in which your judicial duties are discharged. Independently of these particular complaints, however, the President has become satisfied that your administration of the office was not in harmony with the policy he deemed proper to be pursued with reference to Utah affairs, and for this reason he desired to make a change, and out of courtesy gave you an opportunity to resign."

This is an extraordinary letter to come from such a source. In the first place, it contains a reflection upon the Judge's judicial character which either ought not to have been made at all, or ought to have been stated more specifically. In fact, it is no sooner stated than it is abandoned as not being the real cause for removal, and that cause is then said to be that the Judge's administration was "not in harmony with the policy" which the President wishes to have pursued in Utah. The Judge was quick to see the weak spot in this statement, and used it with telling force, as follows:

"In reply, I have the honor to say that my earnest purpose while on the bench as Chief Justice of this Territory has been to administer justice and the laws honestly and impartially to all men, under the obligations of my oath of office. If the President of the United States has any policy which he desires a Judge of the Supreme Court to carry out in reference to Utah affairs, other than the one I have pursued, you may say to him that he has done very well to remove me."

If the Attorney-General cannot do better than this when he is pressed for an excuse for making a removal without cause, he will be much wiser to attempt no excuse whatever, but say simply, what was obviously the truth in this instance, that the removal was ordered because the President desired the place for somebody else.

"When a vacancy occurred in the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs," says the statement given out from the White House on Monday, "the President decided to appoint

Mr. Thomas J. Morgan of Rhode Island to that place." A vacancy did occur in the office, but how? Simply because John H. Oberly, the incumbent, who "has made an excellent record," by the confession of the *New York Tribune*, was notified that he must resign, or he would be removed. Not much is known about Morgan, but the country may at least rejoice over having escaped the threatened appointment of Roderick Random Butler, the Tennessee Republican who was once convicted of selling a cadetship for cash, but nevertheless secured the endorsement of a majority of the Republican members of the last Congress.

A few days ago it was announced that George P. Fisher of Delaware had been appointed by President Harrison First Auditor of the Treasury. The announcement was made the same day that news came of the Johnstown disaster, and the public mind has since been so much engrossed with the details of the calamity that the Fisher appointment has passed almost unnoticed. It is, however, a case which demands attention. The biography of the appointee given out with the announcement of his selection stated that he is a resident of Dover; that in 1863 he was appointed Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and that he held that office until 1870, when he became United States Attorney for the District. But this needs to be supplemented by the recital of certain important facts in his career which are not here even alluded to. On the 22d of June, 1876, President Grant nominated George P. Fisher as United States District Attorney for Delaware. On the following morning the *New York Tribune* published a leading editorial article upon this appointment, entitled "The President's Latest," the chief points of which we reprint:

"The District Attorney's office in Washington was for a long while, under Judge Fisher, the chief bulwark of the District Ring. There were hatched the conspiracies to convict innocent citizens of felony, the plots to get rid of witnesses, the schemes to take burglars out of jail. Crimes of the most dastardly character were committed under the sheltering eaves of that scandalous establishment. Theft, and riot, and bribery, and perjury received there encouragement and protection. Two of the Assistant Attorneys have been tried in the Criminal Court for grave offences, and are to be tried again. George P. Fisher, who was chief of the office during the period when it was a disgrace to the whole nation, could not escape the responsibility for the actions of his subordinates. Whether he was only foolish, inefficient, and weak, or was answerable in some more direct way for the doings of his son Charles and his other assistant, Harrington, we need not inquire. . . . At any rate, public opinion would not tolerate Fisher's appearance in the Safe Conspiracy trial, and, after some miserable revelations of the misconduct in his office, the President was obliged to call for his resignation. And now Gen. Grant nominates this same George P. Fisher United States District Attorney for Delaware. The Senate must reject the nomination without an hour's unnecessary delay. . . . If Gen. Grant will not think of Republican interests, we hope Republican Senators will."

The *Tribune's* earnest protest proved effectual. On the 10th of July its Washing-

ton correspondent telegraphed that "The President has withdrawn the nomination of George P. Fisher, formerly District Attorney for the District of Columbia, and removed for cause, but lately nominated for the position of United States Attorney for the State of Delaware. This is done at Mr. Fisher's own request. The opposition to his confirmation is so great as to convince him that he will be rejected if he allows a vote to be reached. The Senate is a pretty subservient body, but Mr. Fisher, after the exposures of a few months ago, is more than it can swallow." Of course President Harrison was the victim of ignorance and deceit when he appointed this disreputable politician.

Senator Higgins of Delaware was the guest of the Norfolk Club in Boston on Saturday night, and was received with much favor as the first Republican Senator from that State. He made a speech in which he dwelt with much earnestness upon the wrongs which his State had suffered through Democratic rule and the unscrupulous men whom that rule had put in office. He treated his election as an important step towards breaking Democratic rule in the solid South, saying: "I do not ask the men of the North to settle this Southern problem; I do not ask for their interference, but only that they will not go back upon the Republicans of the South who are in earnest in rectifying the wrongs." This appears to have been a more or less direct appeal to the Republicans present not to "go back upon" ex-Judge George P. Fisher of Delaware, whom Senator Higgins has persuaded the President to appoint First Auditor of the Treasury. Does the Senator think the South can be redeemed from misrule by conferring office upon men of that stamp? He asked anxiously, in his Boston speech, "What is the malaria in your atmosphere, what is the poison that you have bred, that led the author of the 'Biglow Papers' to say that the greatest type of American citizen was Grover Cleveland?" Fisher's appointment is a sample of the "malaria" and the "poison" that have driven out of the Republican party not only Mr. Lowell, but thousands of other men who represented its intelligence and conscience in the days of its glory.

The country is now reaping the fruits of "the loot of the Railway Mail Service," and the appointment to responsible places of such men as Paul Vandervoort of Omaha, Neb., who was dismissed from office by Postmaster-General Gresham for insubordination and for absence from his post 265 days in a year. From all quarters come reports of missent and delayed letters and newspapers. A Republican, who is a member of the Boston Scientific Society, writes to the *Herald* that some of his letters apparently miscarry, as he can get no answers to them, and that it took him three days to hear from an adjacent point in New Hampshire. The *New York Times* prints a communication which shows that a letter that was mailed in New York

May 31, at 6 P. M., was not received in Boston until June 5 at 7 P. M. The *St. Louis Republic* mentions several cases where letters mailed in that city and plainly directed to places in Missouri were sent on circuitous routes, one occupying twelve days in its transit. The *New York Age*, a Republican paper conducted by colored men, has had within a month more than 500 complaints from subscribers in all parts of the country of failure to receive the *Age*.

That was a most scandalous performance which the Civil-Service Commissioners unearthed in the Troy Post-office. A Republican having been appointed Postmaster, the clique who manage the politics of the party got together and parcelled out the patronage of the office, so many places being allotted to this ward, so many to that, and so many to the outlying towns, the subdivision of the last being left to the bosses in the several localities. The places must be filled under the Civil-Service Law, but it was taken for granted that no Democrat would be fool enough to suppose that he stood any chance, and no Republican who was not on the list would apply, for fear of punishment for insubordination by the ward leaders; or, if there was any danger that the programme might miscarry by the presence of any "smart" outsider in the examination-room, no blank application need be sent to such suspect. The Commissioners, however, have annulled the examination thus held, and announce that another, and a fair one, will be held two or three weeks hence. "All who enter the examination," they say, "will have the same chance, whether Democrats or Republicans. It is not only unnecessary, but it is absolutely useless, to get any 'backing' or 'support' of any kind. The marking will be given fairly on the merits of the examination passed." The Commissioners further improve the opportunity to announce that "members of boards of examiners, as well as all other employees in the public service, are liable to indictment for violation of the Civil-Service Law, and the penalties for such violation will be rigorously enforced by the Commissioners. Any attempted evasion of the law by an applicant will insure his name being stricken from the list of eligibles." While the spoilsmen are so generally running riot, it is a great pleasure to have such evidence as this that the Civil-Service Commissioners are thoroughly in earnest.

The *Salt Lake Tribune*, after a burst of indignation over the proposed monument to the late Postmaster Pearson, calls on Mr. George William Curtis "to put in words the reasons why Mr. Pearson's memory should be a matter of such public concernment that the great public of the United States should be called upon to contribute towards supplying a fund to erect a monument to his memory." There is one answer that anybody served by the New York Post-office might make, and as it is the only one that would have any weight with the *Salt Lake Tribune*, we will mention it. It is that Mr. Pearson carried on the work of the New York Post-office ef-

ficiently with \$250,000 less money per annum than his successor deems absolutely necessary.

Telegrams from the West state that the Senate Committee on our Canadian Relations have found a pretty general expression of friendliness to Canada, and of a desire for closer commercial relations with that country. Senator Hoar is reported as being much impressed with this unanimity of sentiment on the Pacific Coast and in Minnesota. Perhaps his ears have been more open to suggestions of this kind by reason of the action taken recently by the Boston Executive Business Association, which is a general trades assembly of merchants representing the most important business interests in that city. This body has unanimously adopted a resolution directing one of its committees to appear before Senator Cullom's Committee, and oppose any change in our laws intended to restrict the competition afforded to the merchants and consumers of New England by the Canadian railways. Mr. Alden Speare, President of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, said that there were 560 different points in New England that were now beneficially affected by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that "New England did not desire and would not submit to any curtailment of the privileges which she now enjoyed through the Canadian railways." Such language, coming from a responsible quarter, points to the necessity of sending Mr. Joseph Nimmo, jr., to New England immediately to explain to the misguided people how their interests are suffering by reason of Canadian railroad competition.

The legislative year closes without the passage in any State of a law requiring the publication of campaign receipts and expenditures. Mr. Crosby introduced at Albany a very crude bill relating to this subject, but it was never heard of after its first announcement. A really excellent law, requiring full publication by committees and candidates, after election, of all receipts and expenditures, was passed by the lower house of the Massachusetts Legislature and rejected by the Senate, though it was very generally favored by the press of the State. There is nothing surprising in this failure to make progress. The reform sought aims directly at the greatest evil in our politics, and for that reason it will be desperately opposed by the politicians of both parties. Sworn publication of receipts and expenditures would put an end to the use of large sums of money for corrupt purposes, and, of course, would deprive the men who handle those sums in campaigns and at elections of their chief source of income. These will join hands with all the other men who get a living out of politics, and it will require a long and a hard fight to overcome their opposition.

The Republican Gov. Bulkeley of Connecticut vetoed on Friday the excellent Ballot Bill which was passed by very large majorities in both houses of the Legislature. "His reasons" are, from beginning to end, a bald plagiarism from those with which

Gov. Hill has made us so familiar, and therefore a very tedious and verbose version of the familiar spoilsmen's doctrine in reference to all reforms—"I am in favor of the principle, but against this application of it." Gov. Bulkeley is as much afraid of sworn election officials as Gov. Hill is, and thinks there is grave peril to free institutions involved in taking the control of elections away from irresponsible political workers and putting them into the hands of sworn agents of the State. The strong public sentiment, however, which fairly compelled the Republican majority to pass the bill in the first instance, is manifesting itself so strongly against the Governor's veto that the politicians of the Legislature are unwilling to let the bill fail now. The friends of the measure are acting wisely in consenting to amendments which satisfy some of its opponents, but do not affect in any way the vital principles of the bill. Thus the amendment removing from the act the application of its provisions to town elections in which minority representation is involved, is a concession which does not affect the principle of the bill, and which it may be wise to make, since it will lessen the possibility for confusion in first putting the new system into operation.

The most important amendment suggested is that allowing the grouping of candidates under party names upon the official ballots. This concession was made in the Saxton bill when it was redrafted last winter, and it is also embodied in the Tennessee, Missouri, and Indiana laws. The Wisconsin, Montana, Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island laws follow the order of reception of nominations in arranging candidates' names, and their example was copied by the drafters of the Connecticut bill. There is no valid objection to the grouping by parties. Such arrangement may aid the ignorant voters in marking their ballots, and will certainly diminish the chances of confusion and delay in putting the new system into practice. It might have been wiser for the friends of the bill to have yielded these points when the measure was under discussion in the Legislature, for considerable stress was laid upon them then; but there is slight probability that such yielding would have prevented the Governor's veto. Point after point of that kind has been yielded in New York State to overcome Gov. Hill's objections, but he has found new objections without apparent difficulty. He and Gov. Bulkeley are unalterably opposed, not to minor details of the reforms system, but to the great principle of the system itself—which is a secret ballot, absolutely removed from espionage and interference of all kinds.

The State Assessors, Messrs. Ellis, Wood, and Williams, have been making their annual round of investigation into the values of real estate in New York. A telegram from Albany to the *Times* says that they have found a general depreciation of farm lands. "We have," says Assessor Wood, "visited fourteen counties, and in all we find the same condition of affairs. City prop-

erty is increasing in value, while farming property is growing less and less valuable. I cannot see any way for it to improve, and in a few years you will see more tenant farmers than anything else. No one wants to buy farm lands here. They can't get their money out of them. Most of the farms were bought about war times, when big prices were paid." This information tallies with that furnished by the Connecticut Bureau of Labor Statistics. In the last report of this bureau the profit-and-loss accounts of nearly one thousand farms are given, from which it appears that 54 per cent. of the whole number show an annual loss, or a loss for the year in which the examination was made. Farming in New England and New York ought to be a very prosperous employment, according to the prevailing tariff philosophy, for here we have the very conditions which the protectionists tell us the tariff will bring about, namely, a home market for the products of agriculture. We have lots of factories alongside the farmer ready to take his wheat and bacon, but somehow the result is contrary to the prediction. Farming land continues to decline in value, while town and city land increases in value. There are large tracts of land in the New England States which supported farmers' families a quarter of a century ago, that have been abandoned and are now growing up to forest. Yet here, if anywhere, we ought to find agriculture prosperous and remunerative; there is any virtue in a protective tariff. May it not be true that the object of the tariff, which is to secure profits to manufacturers in order that they may make farmers prosperous, fails in the second half of its aim? Would it not be well to change our fiscal policy for a while—turn it around end for end—and tax the manufacturer for the benefit of the farmer, in order that the latter may have abundant means to buy the goods of the former? After trying this plan for a while we should perhaps all be agreed to adopt a third policy, viz., that of letting every man have and enjoy just what he earns.

Few persons except specialists in electrical science are aware how rapid is the march of electric power over the world. Unused and unused water is everywhere going into the oke of the dynamo. Mountain streams in Switzerland that have never before been used for any purpose except that of gratifying sight-seers are now supplying power to mills five miles distant, and the manufactures of that country are having a great revival. The latest project of this kind in our own country, and one of the most promising, is that of utilizing the power of the "Dalles of the St. Louis," a few miles west of Duluth. These consist of a series of cascades some miles in length, over which the whole volume of the river precipitates itself, with a total fall of more than 500 feet. A local engineer proposes with a single dam on the 'St. Louis to run all the street-cars in Duluth, to furnish all the electric lights needed, and to supply a large amount of power for other uses.

There is room on the river for thirty or forty such dams. It is the common observation of the electrical journals that all the manufacturing dynamos are running night and day, and cannot keep up with their orders.

Prof. Canfield, whose inability to teach political economy in accordance with the views of the majority of voters in Kansas led to his retirement from the University of that State, has been offered and has accepted a professorship in Williams College, Massachusetts, of which institution he is a graduate. Our first information, that Prof. Canfield was driven out of the University of Kansas in consequence of his anti-tariff teaching, was derived from one of the high-tariff organs, the *American Economist*, which expressed much satisfaction over the affair. It appears, however, that that was not the whole of the case. Prof. Canfield's retirement was in large part voluntary. He found the door to promotion in the University shut, as to himself, by reason of his views on protectionism, and he deemed it best to resign, although he had not, at the time, received any offer from Williams College. It is very strange that the University of Kansas has overlooked the claims of Prof. Denslow to the chair of economics vacated by Prof. Canfield, especially at a time when Mr. Andrew Carnegie is distributing Prof. D's 'Principles of Economic Philosophy' at his own expense among our higher institutions of learning. We are informed that one college in New England has received one hundred copies of this work as a gratuity from Mr. Carnegie, for free distribution among students.

The contentions of the Windom worsted decision were, that man's inventions in machinery for separating the long from the short hairs of the covering of sheep, have so obliterated the former trade distinction between worsted and woollen yarns, and the trade difference between worsted stuffs and woollen stuffs, that now everywhere in wholesale business "woollen cloth" is recognized as including "worsted cloth," and that the new trade nomenclature of 1889 should be interpreted into the old tariff law of 1883. We showed last week, from New York trade journals, that the distinction between worsteds and woollens is, in our own country, everywhere applied in 1889 as in 1883. So it is in England, as we infer from market reports in the London *Times* of which this is an example:

"LEEDS, May 18.—The turnover of woollen cloth this week has rather exceeded the average of the last fortnight, and manufacturers have unexpectedly had fresh orders placed with them by American buyers. Solid worsteds, both plain and fancy, sell fully up to the average, and manufacturers' prices for these, as well as for corkscrews, are easily maintained. Some fresh new designs in figured mantlings have been brought out, and the Americans were most on the alert to get first deliveries of them. An average business is doing with the Continent in novelties, both worsteds and woollens."

Was it quite creditable in the officers of the National Association of Wool-Manufacturers

to permit Mr. Windom to be thus misled?

A new pretender to the throne of France has just made a solemn assertion of his right. This is none other than Don Carlos, Duke of Madrid, head of the House of Bourbon, and known in a somewhat limited private circle as Charles VII., King of Spain. "He carries about with him," the Prince de Valori says, "that immaterial empire which makes his pilgrim's staff a sceptre and his humble traveller's cloak a royal mantle." It was at a great banquet in Paris on the 21st of May that this fine speech was made, and the Prince de Valori was announced as the representative of Charles VII. in France. King Charles does not desire the crown of France for himself; indeed, he would not take it, for all his spare time is now occupied with the cares of empire. He has, therefore, appointed his heir, the Prince of the Asturias, dauphin of France *cum jure successionis*. It is expected that all well-disposed persons will govern themselves accordingly. One might well think that even an excellently disposed person would find some trouble in picking his way through a labyrinth of "rights." There is the right of the Comte de Paris, and the right of Prince Jerome, and the right of Prince Victor, and this new right of Don Carlos; of late, too, it has been hinted that there are rights in the family of Lucien Bonaparte, and nobody is ignorant of the right of Gen. Boulanger. There is also, it is proper to remind one's self, a right of France which is now almost exactly one hundred years old.

The Naples correspondent of the *Indépendance Belge* gives an account of the sad fortunes of an Italian band of emigrants to Central America. They went from Venetia in two parties, last year and the year before, numbering 1,000 persons, their destination being Costa Rica. On April 8, 847 of them disembarked at Marseilles, the survivors of the expedition brought home at the expense of the Italian Government. They had gone to Port Limon under contract with an Italian emigration company; skilled laborers to receive \$1.60 a day, and common laborers \$1.00. This, of course, seemed wealth to the poor fellows, who naturally knew nothing of the high cost of the necessities of life in their new home, or of their coming exposure to exhausting labor under a tropical sun and to wasting diseases away from medical care and even from medicine. Once in the midst of such terrible conditions, with many sick and dead, they revolted and refused to work. But the local laws were appealed to; some of them were prosecuted for breaking their contracts, and were condemned to harder labor than that from which they had fled, others were imprisoned, some were even put to the torture. News of their sad plight reached Italy, most fortunately, and the Venetian deputies at once made moving appeals on their behalf in the Italian Parliament. Premier Crispi immediately promised that the unfortunate men should be brought back to their country, and the landing at Marseilles concluded the history of the experiment in which 150 lives were lost in less than two years.

## THE NEW SOCIALISM.

WITHIN the past month two journals have been started in Boston, advocating step-by-step national Socialism. The first of these, the *Nationalist*, numbers among its contributors men of all creeds and no creed—including Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Rabbi Solomon Schindler, and the Rev. Edward Everett Hale. The other, the *Dawn*, is avowedly Christian in faith, and is indeed a new religious journal, having for its one doctrine the essential identity of Christianity and Socialism. Its contributors are mainly ministers—members of a society of "Christian Socialists." The best known of those writing for the first issue is, perhaps, the Rev. James O. S. Huntington, who for years has been at work among the poor of this city as a salaried clergyman, and now enters the ranks of manual labor in order completely to identify himself with the class for whom he is working. In the *Dawn* the doctrine of the brotherhood of man is made the correlative of the Fatherhood of God. In the *Nationalist* there is, of course, no such theological formulation, but the religious spirit is quite as intense. Here it is "the religion of humanity" that is preached, and the "better future" which inspires hope and effort is that which awaits "the heirs of time" when the social revolution is accomplished.

The elevation of thought and sentiment which characterizes these two journals forbids their dismissal with a mere word as to the weakness of their political programme. Almost without exception, the writers are Americans, with the best of Puritan blood. Quite without exception, they belong to what they themselves would call "the privileged classes." Theodore Parker once said that the democracy that was wanted was not that which said, "I am as good as you are," but that which said, "You are as good as I am." In this movement we have a socialism which is of the latter type. Instead of an appeal to the poor that "there is no reason why we who do the hardest and most repulsive work should receive the lowest pay," we find the appeal to the rich that "there is no reason why we who do the lightest and most attractive work should receive the highest pay." The duty of the rich to grant takes the place of the right of the poor to seize. But the fact that it is granting and not grasping which is urged does not signify that it is merely the Socialism of a charity sermon that is preached. On the contrary, it is German Socialism of the most radical type. Not content with making absolute altruism the religion of the individual, it is made the religion of the State—a religion which the State shall impose upon every citizen.

This identification of Christianity with State Socialism is, of course, nothing new. A number of years ago, when Prince Bismarck first broached his policy of diverting the German masses by the rattle of Socialistic playthings, he replied to the objection, "This is Socialism," by asserting, "It is Christianity." Conscientious, no doubt, was the assertion; yet the workings of the principle have not been such as to make any one

really in sympathy with the masses unlearn the old lesson, taught by Adam Smith, that when the national Government interferes in industrial affairs, it always takes as its counsellors the representatives of the richest and most powerful interests. Compulsory insurance of the workmen has been introduced. One-third of the amount to be paid them in insurance is deducted directly from their wages; another third is nominally paid by their employers, but in the long run indirectly deducted, with the additional evil of increasing their dependence upon their present masters by practically involving a deferred payment of wages. The remaining third is paid by the Government—the amount being raised by a protective tax on breadstuffs, which also is paid by the working classes, and yields five dollars to the landlords where it yields one to the Government.

The workings of State Socialism in our own country, whenever administered by the national Government, are similar in character. Subsidies have been granted to railroads because of the indirect benefits they conferred upon the farmers, while none have ever been proposed for the farmers because of the indirect benefits they conferred upon the railroads. The taxing of the poorer classes in order to pay the labor-bill of the richer is the guiding principle of our tariff, but no one ever thought of taxing the richer in order to pay the rent-bill of the poorer. These facts have sufficiently demonstrated that the common good as understood by the national Government is the good of those who are rich and powerful enough to make their influence felt at Washington.

Yet it is national Socialism which the Nationalists and the "Christian Socialists" wish to promote in America. It is, perhaps, somewhat to the credit of their judgment, if not of their logic, that they do not at once attempt to make their reform "planetary." Nevertheless, in advocating a national organization for their coöperative commonwealth they ignore the fact that the coöperative principle has rarely been successfully applied, except by the smallest organizations, political or industrial, and there only when the business management has been easily understood and closely watched by the whole body of the coöperators. In such cases we have nothing to urge against the value of the principle. It is already successfully applied in most departments of public works and in the support of our school system. It is being applied to the suppression of trades which injure the community instead of serving it. It will doubtless be applied more and more rigorously to the prevention of extortion on the part of combinations and natural monopolies. Yet this principle of combined resistance to anti-social forces is very different from that which lies at the basis of German Socialism. The American movement against monopolies, natural and unnatural, is merely to enforce the principle that the capital invested therein shall exact as nearly as possible the rates of interest which the presence of free competition would establish. It is

"dead rent," and the dividends upon certificates representing merely the capitalization of proposed extortion, which cause the entire outcry against Trusts—an outcry which comes mainly from those who would be the last to maintain that there is any industry in which the capital actually employed in production is not entitled to the competitive rate of interest. This principle of competitive rates as the measure of just payment is the one thing in "bourgeois economy" which the Socialists repudiate with the greatest violence. Capital, they say, is entitled to no compensation whatever for its services, and the services rendered by labor are to be compensated according to the needs of the laborers.

The socialistic objection to the democratic doctrine of individual rights is its selfishness. To this it is not enough to reply that the selfishness of seeking one's own good consistently with that of his neighbor is in bright contrast with the reckless egotism which characterizes protectionist Socialism. The democratic doctrine of individual rights is selfish, but it is only half of the democratic programme. Democracy requires as much as Absolutism or Socialism recognizes the promotion of the public good as the basis of individual rights and the measure of individual duties. In democracies, as nowhere else, is the spirit of devotion to the public good present, and in democracies as nowhere else are the contributions which the individual owes to the public measured by the principle of equality of sacrifice. It is true that there is at present no democracy where the principle is consistently carried out. In our own necessities of the poor are taxed in order to increase the superfluities of the rich. But this is not democratic principle. Wherever democracy is strongest and Socialism weakest, as in the local governments of America and Switzerland, the duties of the individual to the public are sought to be proportioned to his means. The extent of the contribution of the individual to the public is measured by the need of the public just as exactly as in Socialism the extent of the contribution of the public to the individual is measured by the needs of the individual.

Democracy, when logical, recognizes the principle of brotherhood quite as much as Socialism, and with much greater accuracy of analogy. It strives to establish equality of opportunities, not equality of recompense. Napoleon once said that the French Revolution meant "*la carrière ouverte aux talents*"—a clear pathway for talent. This is the meaning of democracy, and also the meaning of brotherhood. It strives continually to make the highest mental and moral training more accessible to all in order that each may find his capacity, and then win his place according to his efforts in the service of the public. This is also the meaning of Christianity. Wherever the Church is thoroughly democratized, there its spiritual and intellectual ministrations are made free. In all this there is no departure from the principle of individual responsibility. The true charity is that which develops the high needs of the recipient, not that which satisfies

lower needs. It elevates the manhood of the younger brother, instead of degrading him into a perpetual pensioner. Our democracy does have need to be more large-hearted. It must be moral or Christian enough to keep trying to lessen the contrast between the degrading want of those who have neither the training nor the character for self-support, and the enervating waste of those who, at the other end of society, are equally helpless and useless. Such publications as the *Nationalist* and the *Dawn* give evidence that such will be its spirit. But they do not signify that there will be any abandonment of the lines of development in the past in order to embrace the Socialistic system, which would nihilate individual responsibility and manhood by centring all rights and duties in the State. Democracy will accept the religion of altruism, but it will not enforce it as a State religion.

#### SENATOR EDMUNDS ON "POLITICAL WORKERS."

In the current number of the *Forum*, Senator Edmunds has written elaborately around an inquiry: "To what extent is it wise and proper to reward political workers by offices?" We say he has written *around* the question, because in the paper before us he does not come to close quarters with a remedy for what he concedes to be a tremendous evil in our public life. He testifies that our politics are now "chiefly carried on by those whose ends are purely personal." These he describes as political workers without political convictions or principles, who are conspicuous at the primaries, on the platforms, and in the processions, and who, when party success has been achieved, instantly demand their reward, in the form of an office, as a right. If they do not get the offices, Senator Edmunds says, they look on the party story as their own individual defeat; and when they do get them, they create subordinates who are satellites in organizing a machine for the next campaign. These mercenary partisans do not, he says, include all the political workers, for there are others, who have formed and who hold party opinions, who are not mercenaries toiling for pay, but who, nevertheless, expect offices more or less adapted to their qualifications. These last, he does not add, Mr. Edmunds, regard mercenaries with satisfaction. Finally, there is the great body of the people, whom he describes as wishing "their public servants to be selected for their character, and for their capacity thoroughly to fulfil the duties imposed upon them; and of course, those duties involve matters of national policy or discretion, they would wish the officials to be of the same general political notions as themselves. They do not wish to pay the political worker with a public office he is for any cause unsuited to fill, while they are glad to show their recognition of the unselfish political activity of upright and capable men by intrusting them with the performance of those public duties which they are best fitted to engage in." He declares that each and all of both varieties

of political workers "are displeased in common if any old incumbent, no matter how perfectly he may be discharging the duties of his office, no matter how steadily he may have refrained from 'pernicious activity,' no matter how high his character, no matter how well the public interest is promoted by his service, is not at once dismissed, in order that each one of the claimants may compete for the prize of the vacancy." He condemns both parties as at fault in this relation. He sharply criticises Mr. Cleveland for treating with "ribald and systematic contempt," after his inauguration, the professions made during the canvass, but he visits no condemnation on Harrison by name. He argues, in an interrogative way, for making the "great bulk of the administrative offices of the country" as permanent as the operatives of a railway, but he evidently does not now feel that much will be presently accomplished. He affirms that selfishness and ambition are innate in politicians, and the thirst for office cannot be "much diminished." The most that can be done is, he thinks, to repress its gratification by the appointing power.

Here is the disappointing part of what the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee says, for he only proposes a quickening of the moral sense of voters and Presidents. He distinctly declares that the thirst for office and its gratification (as Harrison is now gratifying it) promote the use of money to buy votes, false registration, and false counting. He would have those engaged officially in "the great body of civil employments" protected by a tenure during good and efficient conduct, and yet he protests against "an office-holding class" even of subordinates like village postmasters, tide-waiters, and clerks who are not officers. On Mr. Edmunds's theories, what can be done? He would have "officials of the same general opinions" as the winning party, and would not have an office-holding class. He would have, nevertheless, the small administrative employments, involving no policy of government, as permanent in tenure as "station-agents, engineers, linemen, and operatives" on a Vermont railway; but he has no word of censure of Harrison. Nor does he, with all his means of observation, seem to realize that, when taxes are to be increased by executive order, the powers that be will insist that each custom-house sampler, opener of packages, examiner, assistant appraiser, deputy collector, entry clerk, and liquidating clerk has to do with that "policy."

It is not for a Senator of Mr. Edmunds's standing to assume that public opinion is torpid on this question, and that until public opinion bestirs itself, nothing can be done. That is the excuse of all who are spoils-hunters at heart. Mr. Edmunds is no spoils-hunter. He sees as plainly as anybody the cancer in the vitals of the body politic. He has an assured position, and it is for him more than for any other Senator to rise in his place and say, "This thing must be stopped," and to introduce and advocate, as he knows how, a measure to stop it. Then public opinion will have a rallying-point, and if it has the elements of growth, it will grow. If he

would put into such a measure of reform half the spirit and assiduity that Mr. Roosevelt put into the reform measures of the New York Legislature a few years ago, or a moiety of the calm courage and conviction of Bishop Potter's centennial sermon, he would not need to repine very long over the laxity of public opinion.

#### THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY SITUATION.

THE Transcontinental Association is composed of railroads whose interest lies largely in traffic to and from the Pacific Coast. These railroads have special problems of their own to solve and special circumstances to face; hence the need of an association separate from the others, although all American roads between the Atlantic and the Pacific are carriers, to a greater or less degree, of transcontinental traffic. California occupies a peculiar place in our commerce, for its products compete partly with those from other portions of our country, but principally with tropical fruits from abroad. From this it follows that the centre of this competition, the place where the fight for Californian supremacy must be won if won at all, is the Atlantic seaboard. This is heightened by the further fact that to the competition of Californian oranges or raisins with those from Italy or Spain is added the competition of the water routes from the Pacific with those by rail.

This state of things the seaboard cities regard with complacency; for in any case, whether from abroad or by sail or steamship from the Pacific, these cities will be well supplied with wine, salmon, prunes, fruit, olive oil, and the like. But it is otherwise with the merchants of the Pacific slope and the rail carriers which depend upon their sales for traffic. If trade is not developed, all transcontinental interests suffer. For many years, until lately, these conditions have been recognized in the tariffs which, on these special products from California to the Atlantic Coast, made rates low enough to allow of sales as against the imported articles; while from California to the interior of our country the rates were such as to be reasonable of themselves, and, although higher than to Boston or New York, yet low enough to compete with the foreign products shipped westward from the cities named. To have refused low rates to our seaboard would simply have reduced California sales on this coast, whose people would continue buying the European fruit; while the loss of the revenue to the carriers from the Atlantic traffic would have required still higher interior rates to earn the same net profit as before.

So matters stood up to the time of the Inter-State Commerce Law and the long discussion about the long and short haul. The theory to which we are settling down is this: that where all carriers are under the Inter-State Commission, a rigid enforcement of this long-and-short-haul principle is possible, but where one or more competitors are freed from the law, it is right that the remaining United States carriers should also be ex-

empt. Now, water carriers are not under the Commission; hence we find a rate of 70 cents to New Orleans from New York, while to Atlanta, a little more than half way, the rate is \$1.14. A rigid levelling would compel the roads to give up New Orleans traffic (to no one's benefit), or accept 70 cents to Atlanta until bankrupt. The Transcontinental Association attempted to apply this water exemption to their tariffs by making a lower rate from California to the Atlantic seaboard than to the Mississippi or Missouri River. These tariffs the Inter-State Commerce Commission condemned as contrary to the law, notwithstanding the existing violations due to water competition in the South and elsewhere. So tariffs no higher to the interior than to the Atlantic were substituted.

The growers and dealers of California have been wailing to the fact that their markets are not wide enough for the disposal of their products, and conventions have been held which seemed to consider the transcontinental roads responsible for the stagnation, because of high freights which forbade sales. The roads did indeed reduce their charges somewhat in answer to these appeals, but the root of the trouble was not reached. This, in brief, is the attempt of the Inter-State Commission, under a wrong sense of duty, to impose upon the land carriers between the Pacific and the Atlantic a strict system of charges, while competing water routes are, from the nature of the case, able to quote whatever they please without reference to the Commission. Under this ruling, demanding equality of charge to all points, the transcontinental roads are placed between two fires: if they make low rates to the Atlantic, the rates to the interior must also be so low as to yield no revenue; while if high rates are made all round, both carriers and California producers lose the Eastern markets. The remedy lies in applying to the California traffic the principle found equitable everywhere else—of low rates when made necessary by competitors not under Government control. To a modified extent, what is here said of water competition between San Francisco and New York applies also to the competition of the Canadian Pacific, for which provision should also be made in the rulings of the Inter-State Commerce Commission.

The Southern Pacific Company has given notice of its withdrawal from the Transcontinental Association because of this unsatisfactory condition of things. The possible disastrous effects of the breaking up of this Association gives emphasis to the statements of the difficulties imposed upon it by the Inter-State Commerce Commission, at whose door the responsibility must be laid.

#### SMALL AND LARGE WORKSHOPS.

THE great evils which have sprung from the massing of workmen in the large factories made necessary by modern industrial development, have been dwelt upon by many writers on social and economical subjects. So, too, it has been the dream of many an

economist that we may yet reach a stage of progress in the application of force when it will be possible to restore the combined house and workshop of other days. Occasional attempts have been made to bring back, on a small scale and as a beginning, those Arcadian times when the smoke of the factory and the crowding of the tenements were unknown, and when every handicraftsman labored, as he lived, under his own vine and fig trees. A writer in the *Century*, a few months ago, gave an account of an experiment in establishing a community of hand-weavers in Westmoreland. The trouble with this, as with other like schemes, is that it stands more upon a benevolent than a business basis, and does not squarely meet the necessary conditions of manufacturing competition. If the thing is ever to be done, it must be with full regard to cost of production.

Something more than a sentimental value, therefore, attaches to the study of the question published in the last *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung*, by Dr. H. Albrecht, since it proceeds precisely along the line of investigating the comparative cost of production in small and large workshops, in the various trades and manufactures, and with the aid of improved and cheaper motors of small power. He begins by inquiring as to the actual state of the case in Germany—that is, as to the number of small compared with large workshops, and as to the proportions of the total working class engaged in each. All shops with five or less workmen he reckons as "small," the others as "large." On this basis, according to the Trades Census of 1882, there were 2,908,294 small shops as against but 97,163 large ones, and 61 per cent. of all German workmen were in the small establishments. Dr. Albrecht next inquires what trades run most to large and what most to small establishments. This is done to find out where the small shops now best hold their own, and so where improved methods may be expected to tell most powerfully. His results are as follows: Out of every hundred establishments devoted to mining, smelting, or the manufacture of salt, ninety-nine are "large"; so are 76 per cent. of the manufactories of chemicals, 75 per cent. of the printing-houses, 73 per cent. of the paper mills, 63 per cent. of the shops for working in metals (iron excepted), 64 per cent. of the manufactories of machines and instruments of all sorts, and 52 per cent. of the establishments devoted to the textile industries. First among the trades which favor the small shops, on the other hand, stands clothing and repairing, 90 per cent. of all the establishments in this branch being "small," as are 78 per cent. of the shops for wood-engraving, 75 per cent. of those devoted to the fine arts, 70 of those of workers in iron, 66 of the shops of the various industries in leather, wax, and gum, and 63 of the manufactories of articles of food and luxury.

With the natural advantages of the small shop in certain trades thus indicated, the next question is as to the progress of invention in making more convenient and cheaper motors for use in manufacture on a small scale, and their ability to compete with the

enormous engines of the huge factory. I. Albrecht takes up and thoroughly discusses four kinds of motors intended for such competition—water motors, hot-air engines, gas motors, and the small steam engine. The results he arrives at are that, on the average, the cost per horse-power per hour is, for water motors, 1.00 marks, for the hot-air engine 0.42, for the small steam engine 0.5 and for the gas motor 0.34. These figures are, of course, but relatively exact, since the price of coal, gas, etc., varies from time to time and in different localities. Taking them as a fair average, however, Dr. Albrecht guesses that the least expensive of these motors, of from one to four horse-power, can successfully compete with the large engines of the great plants. We cannot give here the considerations upon which he dwells, but will only mention some facts which he cites to prove the growing use of such motors. Thus, according to the Trades Census of 1882, gas and hot-air motors constituted but 2½ per cent. of the total number of engines in German shops, yet in printing houses they numbered 50 per cent. of all, fine-art establishments 21 per cent., and shops for working metals 13 per cent.

Very suggestive, also, are the statistics the manufacture of these motors of small power in Germany. Up to the summer of 1888, the five leading manufacturers of gas and hot-air engines had sold 31,000 of these machines, with a total of 94,000 horse-power for use in Germany, besides exporting 20,000 more. In perfect keeping with this showing is that part of a late report of the Inspector of Factories which says: "There is a constant increase in the number of small shops which are seeking, by the introduction of such motors, to appropriate as much as possible the advantages of the large establishments."

Thus far Dr. Albrecht goes upon the firm ground of actual conditions and accomplished facts. His conclusion is that, even as things are now, the small shop is more than holding its own in certain lines of manufacture. But it is in the future that he sees the greatest hope, and, through the perfecting of electric motors and the transmission of electrical force, that he expects to see the day when the small shop fully come back again. He imagines that the greatest difficulty will be the establishment of great central stations for the creation and distribution of electrical currents. Private invention, he thinks, may be left to devise convenient and cheap motors. But the Government, argues in the prevalent German fashion, must furnish the force. Already we have the great municipal electric-lighting plant in Berlin; why not let the dynamos furnish power to the small shops in the distant time? If this were done, and similar methods followed throughout Germany all over the world, it would be the surest way to fulfill the prophecy of the great electrical inventor and expert, Werner Siemens: "The goal of the revolution of science will not be a mass of great factories in the hands of rich capitalists, in which the 'slaves of labor' drag out their monotonous existence, but to return to individual labor."

## HOW WASHINGTON BECAME COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF.

WASHINGTON, June 1, 1889.

It is well to review occasionally our accepted historical conceptions, gauging them by newly discovered material, and, in the clearness of vision that distance of time permits, altering the perspective, or distribution of light and shade, as the confusion of controversy subsides. The recent celebration in New York proves that the popular enthusiasm for the national hero has by no means diminished, but rather increased, in the course of a century; so that it is only just and proper to recur to the past and revise, where necessary, what have wrongly become popular ideas through carelessness, ignorance, or blind adoration. It is to the last that we are most indebted for our historical fallacies.

Washington came to the Presidency the elect of the nation. The movement that led to his selection was spontaneous, unanimous, and heartfelt—such an unquestioned tribute as has rarely been paid to any man. Without him the Constitution would not have been accepted by the States, and it was with him in their thoughts that the Convention created the office of President, and somewhat fearfully clothed it with great powers—for jealousy of power in any national or (to use the more common phrase of that day) federal body or appointment was the bugbear of those who had been most actively engaged in the contest against royal prerogative, the cruel edicts of a corrupt Parliament, and the armies and machinations of a “wicked and abandoned” ministry. The fear and jealousy that were directed against Great Britain in 1763-82, were turned against the Continental Congress and the advocates of a continental policy in 1783-88. It was the personality of Washington that contributed largely to bear down this jealousy; and when he journeyed to New York to assume his high office, it may be truly said that throughout the land there was not heard a voice disapproving the choice.

To read the generally accepted history of the Revolution, one would suppose that it was with a like unanimity that Washington was appointed to the command of the Continental army in 1775; that he then stepped into a position to which the universal suffrage of the colonies was calling him. Nothing could be further from the truth; and to strip the incident of all the romantic features that hero-worship has thrown around it, it may be described, in the somewhat vulgar parlance of to-day, as the result of a “political deal” got up between Massachusetts and Virginia. The result justified the wisdom of the choice, and led to much self-congratulation on the remarkable sagaciousness of Congress and the really marvellous fitness of the man for the place—ideas handed down to us as remarkable instances of prescience on the part of the Congress. The fact was, and we may write it in all reverence, that Washington had not known military service since 1758; that he was better remembered for his defeat and surrender at Fort Mifflin, for his pertinacious and sometimes unreasonable claims for precedence in command, and his obstinate pestering of General Forbes about the proper road to Fort Duquesne, which led Forbes to really dislike him, than for his successful mission to the Ohio in 1753, and his courage and daring under Braddock. For nearly sixteen years he had been without a command, a planter of tobacco and raiser of wheat, a successful manager of a large estate, and an eager and active speculator in Western lands.

This was not the stuff of which a military

hero was made, and while in 1774 the formation of so-called independent companies throughout Virginia in a measure renewed his military prestige, it was not as a soldier that he was thought of, even in his own colony. Jonathan Boucher, the Tory preacher and tutor of Jacky Custis, who knew Washington well, did not err far when he said that the “most distinguished” part of his (W.’s) character was that he was an “admirable farmer”; and no one was more surprised than he to see this man, who had always acquitted himself “decently, but never greatly,” develop into a great leader of armies, and, later, of the people. Edmund Randolph wrote with much truth that, at the beginning of 1774, “some others were more prominent than Washington. It could not have been then truly foretold that the germs of solid worth which afterwards overspread our land with illustrious fruit, would elevate him very far above many of the friends of the Revolution.” While constantly chosen one of the Burgesses from his county, a position that his large estates, serving as a “pocket borough,” gave him, he never attained the honor and pre-eminence of being chosen to the Governor’s council—a reward that marked the happy owner as a favored one and one of the “notables.” He had a wide acquaintance in Maryland, Philadelphia, and New York, and his diaries show how high these acquaintances were in the social life of their respective colonies; but his cold temperament forbade many intimate friends, and it is very doubtful if he could have been described by many of his acquaintances, or could have been recognized even by name outside of these circles. Had he nominated himself and “run” for an office, his standing would have been slight outside of his own county, and none at all outside of his colony. This is sad reading to the romancer on Washington, but the facts bear out this statement of the case.

The Continental Congress of 1774 was more useful in bringing together delegates from the different colonies, and allowing an interchange of views, than for its acts and paper remonstrances. The Bostonians were much pitied throughout the land as objects of ministerial cruelty, but this sympathy was rather for their present sufferings than for what were regarded as their rash and intemperate aims, interpreted then as a desire to be independent not only of Great Britain, but of the other colonies too. Martyrdom was not considered as a good ground for conferring leadership, and a little resentment was caused by the “inward vanity and self-conceit” of the Bostonians, which led them to “assume big and haughty airs,” and to “affect to dictate and take the lead in Continental measures.” Wait, wrote the mild General Gage to his master, and see these Bostonians pay the other colonies “the compliment of taking their advice.” His words were true. In the Congress of 1774, by their explanations and personal intercourse with the other delegates, the Massachusetts men were able to remove in a measure their reputation for rashness, and came to be “universally applauded as cool and judicious.”

Among the Southern members thus influenced was Washington. His letters to Bryan Fairfax prove that he heartily sympathized with the general cause of the colonies before he attended the Congress at Philadelphia. While it was sitting, he saw somewhat of the Massachusetts delegates. On September 28 he records in his diary having dined at Edward Shippen’s, and spent the afternoon with the Boston gentlemen, and Adams notes that he spent that evening at home with Colonel Lee and Colonel Washington, “who came in to

consult us.” On October 7, the two sets of delegates again met at Thomas Smith’s. The result of these meetings is reflected in a letter Washington wrote to one of his old military companions, then in Gage’s army at Boston. Though you are led to believe, he wrote in effect, that the Bostonians are rebellious, setting up for independence, and what not, I know from their leaders that it is not their wish or interest to set up for independence; they are merely desirous of preserving their rights.

Before the second Congress assembled, the old jealousy was revived. Adams records how the Sons of Liberty of Philadelphia met the Massachusetts delegates on the road, and warned them to be moderate and “to recognize the lead of Virginia.” The “fine fellows” from Virginia, who were “very high,” and beside whom the Bostonians were “mere milk-sops,” had evidently made an impression. Deane, who was not very apt to be easily impressed, wrote that he had “never met, nor scarcely had an idea of meeting,” with such men as the Southern provinces had sent to the Congress. In wealth and social position there could be no contrast, as the Southerners were the “capital men” of their colonies, while, with few exceptions, those from the East were men of “desperate circumstances,” risking nothing but their necks in the contest. It was to Virginia that the Presidency of the Congress was given in 1774 and 1775, and when Peyton Randolph left the body, it was on Hancock, the propertied man of the East, that the honor was bestowed. The intimacy between the Adamses and Richard Henry Lee, radicals all, even for that day, in a measure accounts for this division of the honors, and appears to have been the controlling motive for this and subsequent political “deals.”

The Massachusetts delegates brought with them the idea of a continental effort, and as early as June 2 the Massachusetts Congress hinted to the General Congress that as the army then collecting from different colonies was for the general defence of the rights of America, the regulation and control of it was a proper subject for continental action. On the next day Artemas Ward was “from expediency” appointed commander-in-chief by the Provincial Congress, but without any idea of forestalling any action that might be taken at Philadelphia. Learning of this appointment, the New York Congress thought proper to consider a like appointment in that colony, as “the supposition that in case a continental army should be established, these officers will be permitted to preserve their respective ranks, appears to us highly probable.” In Philadelphia the notion of a continental army continually acquired force, until at length action was precipitated, and the step taken—a natural result from the course of events. The question of command now came up for decision.

Early in May, James Warren had expressed the wish that Washington or Lee were in command before Boston—a wish that had probably been inspired by the reports of Washington that the delegates had brought back from the Congress of 1774. Ward was too old to make an efficient commander, and the army too heterogeneous and independent to be easily kept in control. Gates and Lee had reputation for great military knowledge and experience, and Lee especially was much affected by the Eastern delegates. But they were both foreign-born, and both had served in the British establishment, and this was regarded as an objection that overruled what military features were in their favor. Remembering, perhaps, the warning of the Sons of Liberty, and a letter from Warren that may have reached him just before

the nomination of Washington would remind him of it—"I should heartily rejoice to see this way the beloved Colonel Washington, and do not doubt the New England generals would acquiesce in *showing to our sister colony, Virginia, the respect, etc.*"—Adams suggested Washington, but opposition was made. Many of the delegates thought that as the army was nearly all from New England, had a general of its own, and appeared satisfied with him, Ward should receive the appointment. Fear was expressed that the supersession of the New England generals would lead to discontents and break up the army, as the troops were represented as being bound to their own officers. Adams was positive in the matter, and so was Richard Henry Lee, connected by marriage with Washington; but it required several days of effort to remove the opposition, and when the nomination was at length formally proposed by Washington's friend, Thomas Johnson of Maryland, the choice was made "unanimously." As a compensation, and to equalize the terms of the "deal," the first and third major-generals were taken from the Eastern colonies—Ward and Putnam—and of the eight brigadier-generals, all but one were taken from New England. Respect, surely, had been shown to Virginia, but New England did not suffer her claims to be forgotten; and between the two sections all the offices were divided.

The statement of Bancroft that there was only one general officer "who drew to himself the trust and love of his country," is one of those afterthoughts which subsequent events seem to justify. While we find the suggestion of Washington both among the Southern and the Eastern delegates, there was no "general demand" for his election. Indeed, Adams very distinctly states that it was the idea of many "of the staunchest members" of the Congress, and it was the yeast of the activity of a little junto in that body, the Adamses and Lee being its representatives, that leavened the mass. I do not lay much stress on the incident referred to by John Adams, of Washington attending the sessions of Congress in military uniform, thus, as has been suggested, nominating himself for the place. In a few doggerel lines on the Congress of 1774, Drowne says:

"With manly gait,  
His faithful steel suspended by his side,  
Passed W<sup>h</sup>-sh-gt-n along, Virginia's hero."

This may be poetic license, but it is quite as probably a statement of fact. Washington may have worn a sword, the House of Burgesses may have worn a uniform when in session, and it may have been this that Adams had in mind. The incident is more curious than important.

No one admitted more frankly the political nature of his election than Washington himself. "The partiality of Congress, joined to a political motive, really left me without a choice," he wrote to his brother, and he uses nearly the same words in letters to Col. Bassett and the Virginia military companies. To his wife he wrote as if he had expected the appointment, and could not decline it if it were made:

"You might, and I suppose did perceive, from the tenor of my letters, that I was apprehensive I could not avoid this appointment, as I did not pretend to intimate when I should return. This was the case. It was utterly out of my power to refuse this appointment, without exposing my character to such censures as would have reflected dishonor upon myself and given pain to my friends."

Adams was naturally jubilant over the success of his policy. "This appointment will have a great effect in cementing and securing the union of these colonies." An anonymous writer from Philadelphia said that "Washing-

ton, a delegate from Virginia, is, at the particular request of the people in New England," appointed; but this is claiming too much, as the "people" were not so much as consulted, and it is doubtful if the people would have ratified the choice, had it been submitted to them. Gage, with a truer insight in the matter, wrote to Dartmouth of "much division in Congress, jealousy of the Eastern delegates, owing to which Washington was appointed to the chief command of the rebel army." The act was, in fact, due to the efforts of a few of the more far-sighted leaders of the Revolution, and was made successful by colonial pride and jealousy.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

#### PREHISTORIC CHRONOLOGY.

ATHENS, May 12, 1889.

THE recent excavations at Mycenæ, taken in connection with the earlier and better-known facts relating to that most important of all ancient cities to the archæologist, throw a curious little side-light on some points of what, for want of a better term, I must call prehistoric chronology. Very little, it is true; and such as might be aptly compared to a glow-worm in a tomb, scarcely serving for more than direction, not for distance. So long as we are in the range of epigraphy or of sculpture of known schools, we have tolerably fair indications of time within the century, and ceramics and numismatics afford a general and in many cases an accurate guide to their epoch of production; but beyond these there is no datum which archæologists agree in admitting to the witness-box. Philologists rarely bring themselves to a profound interest in prehistoric questions, because the moment they step out of the range of the light which comes from literature, all evidence is to them too vague to be trusted as real; coinage hardly runs into the prehistoric, and pottery is too provincial to be a guide to epoch.

The introduction of letters, as might be understood, furnishes the indispensable condition to the permanence of tradition; and as a matter of fact, I believe the distinction between the purely mythical and the personal, *i. e.*, historical, must be drawn at that epoch. If we examine the traditions of the classical world with reference to this distinction, we shall find that from a date not long subsequent to the Trojan war (or that ethnical movement which is so symbolized)\* genealogy and chronology become consistent and normal, while prior to that they are so mingled with myth that it is impossible to distinguish any individuality—persons representing dynasties, nations, or even epochs.† Thus Zeus, type of the entire Pelasgic civilization and religion, is represented as born in Arcadia (Pausanias VIII. 38, 41) and in Crete, as well as in Italy, where was situated the kingdom of his father, the realm of the seven Saturnian cities; while the earliest tradition of his worship is in Dodona—the interpretation being, that the Pelasgi, originating in Thessaly, formed empires in Italy, the Peloponnesus, and Crete, being the first civilizers in those regions ("La légende et l'histoire en Thessalie," Paul Monceaux, *Revue des Études Grecques*, April-June, 1888). It is, however, only after the return of the Greeks from Troy that we begin to get legitimate genealogies of the kings even of Greece; before that, the gods were always responsible for the birth of all greatness; Hercules in the Peloponnesus and

Minos in Crete being the sons of Zeus, and both being really types of epochs of civilization, of organization of labor and public works; Dædalus being the arts developed in Crete through the union of the Pelasgic and Asiatic elements (symbolized in the rape of Europa by Zeus) and their joint establishment in that island (Schubring, 'History of Agrigentum,' "Dædalus, representative of the Pelasgic arts").

First of all, and long anterior to the Dædalian stage, was the Herculean, *i. e.*, the Pelasgic civilization in the Peloponnesus; Hercules being fabled as born at Tiryns, which, so far as can be determined by the structure, was the first Pelasgic city in the peninsula. Mycenæ could not have been much later, and in the remains there, still to be seen, are the technical evidences of an antiquity of which we can have but a very vague conception. The great tomb known as the Treasury of Atreus is familiar to all who have visited Greece, and has been to me for more than twenty years, but it was only after a long study, the result of repeated visits, that I began to realize the importance of it; and only now that I have been able to examine the ruins most recently uncovered by the excavations of the Archæological Society have I begun to form an idea of the comparative chronology of the city. This tomb (if it is a tomb) is a structure of the flourishing period of the Pelasgic rule, and, except the walls, is the only remains of that time. It is built of a hard conglomerate found in the vicinity, and the lintel of the door is composed of two stones, of which the inner one (which carries the weight of the stone above itself) weighs about 150 tons, and has been worked without the aid of cutting tools. So have all the minor stones in the structure, which have been split, hammered into shape, and then polished by trituration. Inside are to be seen numerous drill-holes, in some of which are the remnants of bronze nails employed to fasten on the bronze plates which formed a lining to a part of it at least. In the conglomerate occur occasional fragments of the opaque cornelian used by the archaic Italian gem-cutters for their scarabæi, and which after them were the favorite material of the Etruscans for the same purpose. These still retain a brilliant polish and project from the surrounding surface nearly a line. The other material has been corroded away by the action of the elements so equally that, wherever the cornelian appears, it has about the same relief. The original surface of the limestone has entirely disappeared, leaving the harder stone only to tell the manner in which it was worked, with a secondary indication in the depressions left in the splitting of the stone; and the ensemble shows clearly that no chisel could have been employed. For the rest, we have ample proof in later work that the cutting of stone was not practised till long after. I am speaking now of the interior of the building, which must have had the minimum of exposure to the elements. The entrance of the tomb, which was never intended to be covered in, was ornamented with an architectural façade of some sort, apparently. Two pilasters at the sides of the doorway are indicated, and the base of one of these pilasters, in a ruined condition, is still lying at one side of the entrance, the condition of its surface corresponding to the general condition of the front of the tomb. But this façade has been restored in later times, and the bases of the new pilasters are in their places. They seem to me to indicate that the work was possibly never finished; but, if finished, it must also have been done before the builders had learned to cut stone, for though of a gray marble not nearly so hard as the harder nodules in the conglomerate, they

\* I offer no views on any question connected with this subject, it being entirely immaterial to my study what the Trojan war was, or who Homer or his authority.

† Pausanias VIII. 6, "And as to the nation [Arcadians] generally, their most ancient event is the war against Ilion."

are only roughed out with the stone-saw. The faces of the door-jambs, which are slightly recessed, are also redressed with the saw, but it is clear that it has been done on an old surface, and the demarcation between the two is perfectly recognizable to the slightest scrutiny.

Now, what I want to call attention to particularly is the fact that, though the original surface of the stone, inside and out, of the tomb is entirely corroded away by the elements, the saw-marks of the restoration are as fresh as if they had been made only a few months or days, not a line or scratch being effaced. The workmen sawed in at right angles till the cuts nearly met, when they broke out the resulting prism, and the fracture is sharp and crystalline still! But the stone saw was not introduced into Greece till the seventh (or possibly the eighth) century B. C., so that this restoration of the ancient tomb could not have been earlier than the Achaian dominion. There are no chisel-marks, so it could not have been later than the sixth century B. C., for we have abundant proof that at that time the Greeks were fully in possession of the stone-cutter's art. It was in all probability, then, of the interval between the sixth and the eighth. The absence of chisel-marks might be accounted for by an unfinished state of the work; but the second tomb, between this and the city, is largely of the same workmanship, and, so far as I could see, has no chisel-work on it; and the same is true in a more unmistakable manner of the relief over the Lion gate, which was done, no doubt, with the best art of its day. The stone has been sawn out, and the relief has been done with a drill, and with trituration for the finishing, and the drill-marks are clearly visible still. The right-hand jamb of the gate shows slight marks of what may have been a saw; but I am inclined to think that the gate itself, substantially as it stands, is of early work, as the sally-port certainly is, the lintel being fitted on with a mortice and tenon, rudely broken out—a difficult job, which, at least so far as the tenon is concerned, would have been very easy with the saw. Moreover, the jambs and lintel are clearly enough old work. There are also some fragments of half-worked stone of the same kind in the outer court of the city, thrown aside when the interment was made which Schliemann discovered (or, rather, which Stamatakis discovered, for, in the actual finding of the remains and treasure, Schliemann had no responsibility), which have the saw-marks and fracture quite fresh. The same holds true at Tiryns, where the jamb of the great gate is still standing of old work, and the fragments of the sawed stone from the later city which were employed in the reconstruction which Schliemann mistook for the archaic palace, the residence of Proetus, are to be seen in various parts, being stones extracted from the ruins and utilized long after.

Between the construction of the old tomb and the restoration there must have been a lapse of many centuries. The former belongs to the archaic city, the Pelasgic Mycenæ; and we know that between the Pelasgic dynasty and the Achaian there was the Danaid and the Pelopid. The Achaian, being at its prime at the epoch of the Trojan war, coincides with the period to which I pointed above as the demarcation between mythology and history, and the earliest documents in regard to which are the Homeric poems. Beyond that we have absolutely no other criterion of the lapse of time than the contrast between the corroded surface of the earliest work on this tomb and the fresh and crystalline surface of the Achaian restoration. But if we might make a rule of

three of it, and ask if the lapse of twenty-five centuries (or, if we suppose that the later stone was worked the day before Mycenæ was destroyed by the Argives, more than twenty-three) has produced so slight an effect on the surface of cut stone, how long would it take to produce the utter obliteration of the worked surface which we find in the older work? The only answer we can make is, that the calculation defies arithmetic, even beggars guess-work.

In the recent excavations, conducted by the most intelligent and experienced of the official Greek working archaeologists, Tsountas, there has been discovered on the summit of the acropolis of Mycenæ the ruins of a palace which I am fully persuaded belongs to the period of the great Mycenaean rule, built of beautifully polished blocks of stone with marble floors and what was once a grand stone staircase. It is so far only a vestige, but enough to judge of what it must have been. I am not bold enough or easy enough in my beliefs to call it Agamemnon's palace, nor should I carry it so far into the debatable times; but I am ready to attribute it, on the present evidence, to the time when the lions were put over the gateway—probably to the height of the prosperity of the city. It is only incompletely excavated as yet, and, when entirely disengaged from the débris of later constructions over it, may be far more significant than it seems now. As it is, however, I consider it the most important relic of the heroic age for technical study we have yet found in all Greece—not Agamemnonian, but perhaps Homeric, and probably standing when Mycenæ was overthrown after Platea, for, so far as we know, Mycenæ had never before been taken, its walls being considered impregnable, so that it was finally starved out. That it was utterly ruined we are told by Strabo and Pausanias both, and this has been long admitted as the historical end of the city; but the excavations have shown that it was inhabited again, for this ruin has been reconstructed after a rude fashion, and fitted for human residence, and then again ruined and reconstructed—perhaps more than once. On the very summit, too, is the trace of a wall indicating that a building stood there, which Dr. Dörpfeld has set down in his plan of the excavations as an Hellenic temple. But besides the parallelogram of the foundations, there is nothing to indicate that it was a temple, or the epoch to which it belonged. That it was not a Christian church is clear from its plan, but not a trace of column or capital remains to show that it was a temple, or of what epoch, if a temple. Round the foundation walls, however, were found tiles stamped with the town mark, showing that it was probably a public building, and the characters are those of the first or second century A. D. Among this débris was an inscription, apparently of the second century B. C., acknowledging a gift of 500 drachmas to the town, and one of the time of Nabis, tyrant of Sparta, rendering him thanks for the liberation of a number of citizens of Mycenæ, which is thus shown to have been reoccupied and inhabited possibly for four centuries subsequent to its supposed abandonment. That the structure supposed to be a temple could have been left standing by the Argives is impossible, for it is constructed partly over the palace I have spoken of, which was clearly burned; and that it was occupied in the second century A. D. is shown by the roof-tiles round it. By the inscription found near it, it is indicated as the locality used for the publication of decrees down to the Roman conquest. It must therefore have been a construction of the reoccupation, as its poor and unsubstantial foundations suggest.

On the hypothesis that it was of a temple of

the fifth or sixth century B. C., this foundation wall was used as an argument in the discussion between Schliemann and myself, on the antiquity of the ruin on Tiryns, to show that the rubble walls under it must be archaic, and that therefore the rubble walls of Tiryns were equally so. But not only does not the argument hold, through the demonstration of the late period of the supposed temple, but the similarity between the walls in question does not obtain. Those of Mycenæ in question are of rubble and mortar, and are probably of the last centuries B. C., but those of Tiryns contain brick as well as mortar and the ruins of a Byzantine chapel, and the site was covered over with fragments of Byzantine pottery.

The general conclusion is the same for both cities. Mycenæ was reoccupied by a poverty-stricken population returned to their ancestral homes and profiting by the still strong walls, which it is easy to see have been repaired, and the ruins of the ancient houses. Tiryns was only reoccupied by the Byzantine colony who were its last inhabitants; in both cases the colonists utilized the stones of the ancient constructions so far as they would work in, but in Mycenæ there is a trace of the ancient house-wall to give an idea of the architecture, while in Tiryns there are only some door-sills and fragments of sawn stone of the Achaian epoch; of the ancient walls not a trace. The presence of well-burned brick laid in mortar is conclusive on this point, and of this I was able at this visit to satisfy Mr. Tsountas, who accompanied me in the review. The Byzantine character of the ruin has always been admitted by the principal Greek archaeological authorities.

But what we may yet learn from the excavations in Mycenæ is hardly to be conjectured, for thus far only a small portion of the acropolis has been cleared out. Another gate connected with a gallery resembling those of Tiryns has been opened, and a series of tombs excavated in the solid rock, but resembling in plan the great tomb, have been discovered. In them occur many of those curious engraved gems known as "island stones," resembling in the character of design the relief on the lion gate and practically establishing the conclusion that they are the work of the same art.\* They are not Phœnician, and so far they are mainly found in the isles of the Greek archipelago, and especially in those to which we know that the Cretan civilization extended. No inscribed articles have been found in them, but some ivory carvings have a decided Assyrian character. Tsountas believes that there are many more to be opened, and as a fair proportion of

\*These gems furnish one of the most interesting technical problems of prehistoric archaeology. They are of archaic workmanship and of the lentoid or scaraboid shape, with a perforation showing that they were intended to be used as seals. The cutting, though of widely varying character of archaism, is always masterly, and those found in the tombs at Mycenæ are of great range of workmanship, and mostly of the monumental design of which the lion relief is an example universally known. Two or three of these, indeed, closely resemble that monument, and the lion is a favorite element in the design. Two lions reared with the fore feet on an altar occur twice in the collection made by Tsountas, with others of other animals in the same relation. The lion tomb in Phrygia is another well-known case, and it has been adduced as a proof that the art came from Phrygia; but Prof. Ramsay, who discovered it, is of the opinion that it is later than the relief of Mycenæ, and that the art of which it is one of the examples came from the west in a developed state. See the interesting article by Prof. Ramsay in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* for October, 1888, which has just reached me, and some of the conclusions in which are curiously near to some of my own formed on other grounds and prior to having read his paper. He says: "If the date which I assign to the Phrygian monuments, viz., the two centuries preceding 675 B. C., is accepted, I do not think it is allowable to place the Mycenaean gateway earlier than the ninth and it is more likely to belong to the eighth century." In conversation with him I had learned the opinion he had formed, but knew nothing of the grounds for it, and the article which I call attention I have only read since the above letter was written. I am, however, disposed to differ with him in one point, and that a most important one: I should refer the art to which we owe both the monuments in question to Crete for its beginnings, and consider it an offshoot of the Dædalian.

them are found to be virgin, there is a good chance still of finding something to throw light on their provenance, which I am confident is at least not Phœnician. Tsountas is now at work on a large tomb of the same character near Sparta which has the appearance, so far as explored, of never having been plundered. I hope to be present at the final clearing.

W. J. STILLMAN.

## HARRIET SHELLEY AND CATHERINE NUGENT.—II.

DUBLIN, May 11, 1889.

XI.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

TAN-Y-RALLT, Jany. 16th [1813].

*My dear Mrs. Nugent,*

The sight of your well known hand was like intelligence from the dead to the living. Shall I say that it gave me only pleasure? no, that is too cold a word to convey the feelings of happiness, in which we all alike participated. I am sorry to hear you have been so much engaged, as I cannot bear the idea of a woman like yourself being obliged to do that which so many are better qualified to perform. I saw with very great sorrow the ruin of so many of your valuable manufactories. I knew how many of your unfortunate countrymen suffered all the miseries of famine before, and now there must be many more. That the wounds of thy beloved country may soon be healed for ever, is the first wish of an Englishwoman who only regrets her being born among those inhuman beings who have already caused so much misery wherever they turn their steps. All the good I wrote of Mr. Madoco I recant. I find I have been dreadfully deceived respecting that man. We are now living in his house, where formerly nothing but folly and extravagance reigned. Here they held their midnight revels, insulting the spirit of nature's sublime scenery. The sea which used to dash against the most beautiful grand rocks, for grand indeed they are, and the mind is lost in contemplation of them towering above one another, and on the opposite side the most jagged mountains, whose peaks are generally covered in clouds, was to please his stupid vanity and to celebrate his name, turned from its course, and now we have for a fine bold sea which there used to be, nothing but a sandy marsh uncultivated and ugly to the view. How poor does this work of man seem when standing on one of the mountains we see them all rising one behind the other looking as tho they had stood the iron grasp of time many centuries. Then to look down on this embankment which viewed from the height looks as if a puff of wind from the mountains would send it to oblivion like its founder's name. The harm that man has done through his extravagance is incalculable. Here he built the town of Tremadoc and then almost ruined its shopkeepers by never paying their just debts. We have been the means of saving the bank from utter destruction, for which I am extremely glad, as that person who purchases it will reap very great benefit from it. I admire your song much, and am determined to set it to some very plaintive tune. I have seen Miss Curran: she resides in England. What I saw of her I did not like. She said begging was a trade in Dublin. To tell you the truth she is not half such an Irishwoman as myself, and that is why I did not feel disposed to like her. Besides she is a coquette the most abominable thing in the world. I met her at Godwin's house alas [paper torn] Godwin he too is changed, and filled with prejudices, and besides too he expects such universal homage from all persons younger than himself, that it is very disagreeable to be in company with him on that account, and he wanted Mr. Shelley to join the Tory party and do just as they pleased, which made me very angry, as we know what men the Tories are, now. He is grown old and unimpassioned, therefore is not in the least calculated for such enthusiasts as we are. He has suffered a great deal for his principles, but that ought to make him more staunch in them, at

least it would me. Eliza and Percy desire their kind regards to you with many thanks for your embassy to Stockdale, who will hear from Mr. S. soon. Adieu, dearest friend to liberty and truth, and that you may ever be happy is the first prayer of your affectionate friends

H. SHELLEY.

XII.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

May 21st [1813] COOKE'S HOTEL }  
ALBERMARLE-STREET, LONDON }

*My dear Mrs. Nugent*

I find the longer a time elapses before I make my apology for not having written before, the more awkward I feel at the idea of addressing you. My greatest consolation, however, is derived from this—that you will not attribute my silence to neglect, but to the hurry and bustle of a city. I am ashamed to say I have written to no one since I arrived here, if that can extenuate my crime. You would pardon me if you knew in what a scene of confusion I live. To give a description of it is impossible. Even now there are two waiters in the room to lay our cloth for dinner, and you well know the movements of a waiter are far from silent. I have been in London a long time, though it seems to me that I have only been here a few days. Mr. Shelley's family are very eager to be reconciled to him, and I should not in the least wonder if my next letter was not sent from his paternal roof, as we expect to be there in a week or two. His father has been in town, when, at the earnest solicitation of his cousin, Bysshe wrote to him. He has not yet answered the letter; but we expect it daily. Their conduct is most surprising, after treating us like dogs they wish for our Society. I hope it will turn out well, tho' I hardly dare suppose so. My sister has joined me some time. You may suppose I was not a little pleased to see her again. We have not got our boxes yet, that were sent from Cork to Bristol, and when we shall see them again is uncertain. Mr. Ryan dines with us to-day. I give him meat, but we have all taken to the vegetable regimen again, which I shall not leave off, for I find myself so much better for it, that it would be very great injustice to eat flesh again. Have you seen Mr. Lawless? He wrote to us from prison a few weeks ago, but I do not suppose he was there, because Ryan knew nothing about it, and he is only just arrived from there. This is franked by La Touche, for I feel it is not worth postage. I hope to hear from you soon, tho' I feel I do not deserve it; but you are too kind to take any advantage over me. Mr. Shelley continues perfectly well, and his poem of Queen Mab is begun, tho it must not be published under pain of death, because it is too much against every existing establishment. It is to be privately distributed to his friends, and some copies sent over to America. Do you [sic] any one that would wish for so dangerous a gift? If you do, tell me of them, and they shall not be forgotten. Adieu! All unite in kind regards to you, and I remain your sincerely attached friend

H. SHELLEY.

Direct to this hotel

XIII.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

June 22d [1813] COOKE'S HOTEL }  
DOVER STREET, PICCADILLY }

*My dear Mrs. Nugent,*

The kind expressions contained in your last letter gave me sincere pleasure, feeling as I did that I had not acted according to my ideas of right and wrong in delaying writing to you. I am sorry to hear that poor Lawless is confined. If he had taken his friends advice all his debts would have been settled long ago; but pride, that bane of all human happiness, unfortunately stopped, and marred all his good prospects. Mr. Ryan is still in London; but I expect to hear daily of his leaving us. Have you had any good weather, for ours is miserable? our summer has not yet commenced. The fruit is still sour for want of sun, and will continue so from the present appearance of the weather. Our Irish servant is going to leave. Poor fellow, he pines after his dear Ireland, and is at the same time very ill. He was never of any use to us; but so great was his attachment that we could not bear to send him away. Mr. Shelley has broken off the negotia-

tion, and will have no more to say to his son, because that son will not write to the people of Oxford, and declare his return to Christianity. Did you ever hear of such an old dotard? It seems that so long as he lives, Bysshe must never hope to see or hear anything of his family. This is certainly an unpleasant circumstance, particularly as his mother wishes to see him, and has a great affection for him. What think you of Bonaparte? To most of the Irish he is a great favorite; I only wish we had peace. So long a war as this has been is indeed too dreadful to continue much longer. How is your health? I am afraid you sit too close to your business, to enjoy good health, yet, as the winter is gone, surely you need not make any more warm tippets! That will be time enough next November. We have not seen much of Godwin, for his wife is so dreadfully disagreeable that I could not bear the idea of seeing her. Mr. S. has done that away, tho' by telling G. that I could not bear the society of his darling wife. Poor man, we are not the only people who find her troublesome. Mr. S. joins me and Eliza in kind regards to you, and believe me yours with esteem

H. S.

XIV.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

August 8th [1813] HIGH ELMS HOUSE, }  
BRACKNELL, BERKSHIRE }

*My dear Mrs. Nugent*

I confess I have been guilty of seeming unkindness in not writing before; but such a multiplicity of business has occupied me ever since the receipt of your last that I have not had a moment to spare, even to you, my kind friend. The babe is quite well, and very much grown. She is indebted to you for many kind enquiries, which one day she will thank you for in person. Mr. S. is of age; but no longer heir to the immense property of his sires. They are trying to take it away, and will I am afraid succeed, as it appears that there is a flaw in the drawing up of the settlement, by which they can deprive him of everything. This is a beautiful idea, and well worthy the noble men who have formed it, among whom I suspect a certain *great personage*. They have put it into Chancery, tho' I fancy it can and will be kept an entire secret, you may suppose that he will do everything to prevent this shameful abuse of property, as we are convinced that more good would be effected if we have it, than if they regain it. We are now in a house 30 miles from London, merely for convenience. How long we remain is uncertain, as I fear our necessities will oblige us to remove to a greater distance. Our friends the Newtons are trying to do everything in their power to serve us; but our doom is decided. You who know us well may judge of our feelings. To have all our plans set aside in this manner is a miserable thing. Not that I regret the loss, but for the sake of those I intended to benefit. Mr. S. unites with me and Eliza in kind regards, whilst believe me your firmly attached friend,

H. S.

XV.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

Sept. 10 [1813] HIGH ELMS HOUSE, }  
BRACKNELL, BERKS. }

*My dear Mrs. Nugent*

I hasten to answer your last letter and to give you the same hopes which we entertain about the subject of my last. Mr. Shelley has seen his Father and told him of what he heard, which he denied, and received him very kindly. Since then his lawyer has employed a council [sic] His opinion is at present pending. I have no doubt now, tho' I had at first, that they can take it away. I have a very bad opinion of all lawyers in general, and I rather think Mr. S's lawyer was either told so by some one, or he thought it necessary to employ a council. They are for ever playing a losing game into each others hands. I am very sorry to hear you have been so ill. I hope sincerely you will soon recover, and do not, I pray you, sit so close to your business, for it is not one that contributes to the happiness of the many, only the few, who ought not in my opinion, to indulge in such useless luxuries at the expense of so many who are even now at a loss for food. Of late we have had many arguments concerning the re-

spect that all men pay to property. Now what do you think of this affair? I wish much to know if your ideas on this subject correspond with ours? I will not tell you what they are yet as I have an excellent reason which you will acknowledge when you hear it. The post has just brought me a letter from Mr. Shelley's sister, who says that her father is doing all in his power to prevent his being arrested. I think even his family pride must long to give way on the present occasion. [Paper torn] keeps everything a secret, but Mrs. Shelley tells her son everything she hears. I will write again soon and tell you everything that takes place. With every good wish for your happiness, in which we all unite, believe me most affectionately your friend,  
H. SHELLEY.

We think of going to our favourite Nantgwilt but not yet. you will certainly hear from me again at this house before we can go. Let me hear from you soon.

XVI.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

SUNDAY, October 11th [1813].

*My dear Mrs. Nugent,*

We are again among our dear mountains. One week has sufficed to perform a journey of more than 300 miles, with my sweet babe, who I am most happy to say has received no injury from the journey. I am now staying at Linwood Inn, which is close to the Lake of Windermere in Westmoreland. We do not wish any one to know where we are. Therefore if any one should ask you I rely upon friendship for not satisfying their curiosity. Have you seen Daniel? We were obliged to discharge him, for his conduct was so unprincipled that it was impossible to have him in our service any longer. Is Mr. Lawless out of prison yet? Had he not taken us in as he did, Bysse would have done something for him; but his behaviour was altogether so dishonest that Mr. Shelley will not do anything for him at present. If he wished it he could not, for he is obliged to pay 3 for 1 which is so ruinous that he will only raise a sufficient to pay his debts. In November he is to see his father; but I do not expect they will settle anything, for Mr. S. will never give way to his son in the least. How has your health been since I heard from you last? I sincerely hope you are better, and that you will take care of yourself. I wish you could see my sweet babe. She is so fair, with such sweet blue eyes, that the more I see her the more beautiful she looks. Some day, my dear friend, I hope you will come to England, and pay us a visit. When we get our dear Nantgwilt; then I may make sure of you. Mr. S. joins me and Eliza in kind regards to you, and may you ever be happy is the best and first wish of your sincere friend.

H. SHELLEY.

Direct your letter to me at Mrs. Calverts, Greta Bank, Keswick, Cumberland.

XVII.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

EDINBURGH, October 20th [1813].

*My dear Mrs. Nugent,*

My last letter was written from the lakes of Cumberland, where we intended to stay still next; but not finding any house that would suit us we came on to this far-famed city. A little more than two years has passed since I made my first visit here to be united to Mr. Shelley. To me they have been the happiest and the longest years of my life. The rapid succession of events since that time make the two years appear immeasurably long. I think the regular method of measuring time is by the number of different ideas which a rapid succession of events naturally give rise to. When I look back to the time before I was married I seem to feel I have lived a long time. Tho' my age is but eighteen, yet I feel as if I was much older. Why are you so silent, my dear friend? I earnestly hope you are not ill I am afraid it is nearly a month since I heard from you. I know well you would write oftener if you could. What is your employment on a Sunday? I think on those days you might snatch a few minutes to gratify my wishes. Do not direct your letter to me at Mrs. Calverts; but to the post office in this city. We think of remaining here all this winter. Tho' by no means fond of cities, yet I wished to come here,

for when we went to the lakes we found such a set of human beings living there that it took off all our desire of remaining among the mountains. This City is, I think, much the best. The people here are not so intolerant, as they are in London. Literature stands on a higher footing here than anywhere else. My darling babe is quite well, and very much improved. Pray let me hear from you soon. Tell me if I can do anything for you. Mr. Shelley joins me and Eliza in kind regards to you, whilst I remain your affectionate friend  
H. S.

Do not tell anyone where we are.

XVIII.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

NO 36 FREDERICK-STREET EDINBURGH }  
[Postmark 23 Nov. 1813.] }

*My dear Mrs. Nugent*

Your letter called forth the most lively feelings of regret. It is so long since I received a letter from you that I began to feel the greatest anxiety on your account. How much do I feel for your ill state of health. Tell me if I can be of any service to you. How are you situated with respect to personal comfort and attendance? Have you anyone by you who can sympathize with you? If you have not let me come and attend you. It is the office of a friend to soothe the languid moments of illness. The mind looks for sympathy more at such a time than when in perfect health. I am afraid Lawless has practised upon you, as he did upon us. Some time back he wrote to Mr. S. about Daniel, who lived with us, saying we had not treated him well. Now the truth is this—we were very fond of this man. He appeared so much attached to us, with so much honesty and simplicity, that we kept him tho' of no use whatever. For the whole time he stayed with us he never did anything. Afterwards he turned out very ungrateful and behaved so insolently that we were obliged to turn him away. This is the man Lawless wrote about; but do not think I am offended at what you say of him, as I know it proceeds from the goodness of your heart. I only wish the object was more deserving of your kindness. There has been no conciliation between Mr. [paper torn] his father. Their opinions are so contrary that I do not think there is the least chance of their being reconciled. His father is now ill with the gout; but there is no danger I suppose. If there was he would send for his son, and be reconciled to him. I sincerely hope this will find you better. You know what pleasure it would give me to render you any service. Therefore do not let a false opinion of justice keep you from applying to me in anything in which I can serve you. Mr. Shelley and Eliza join me in all good wishes for the recovery of your health, and believe me the most firmly, your attached friend,

H. SHELLEY.

XIX.—*Harriet Shelley to Mrs. Newman.*

*Madam,*

It is so long since I have heard from my amiable friend Mrs. Nugent, that I begin to fear she has quitted this world of sorrow and pain. If she has, no human being will regret her loss more than myself. I must beg you to write by return of post and tell me all the particulars. If I am wrong in my conjectures tell her to write if only one line to her most attached and faithful friend,

H. SHELLEY.

23 CHAPEL STREET GROSVENOR SQUARE  
August 8th [1814]

XX.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

August 25th [1814] }  
23 CHAPEL STREET }

*My dear Mrs. Nugent,*

I am afraid you will think I am not sincere, when I tell you what pleasure the sight of your handwriting caused me. I think as you do with the greatest horror on the present state of things—giving the slave trade to France for seven years. Can anything be more horrible? Peace has been hardly purchased at this price. I am dreadfully afraid America will never hold out against the numbers sent to invade her. How senseless all those rejoicings are! Deluded beings, they little know the many injuries that are

to ensue. I expect France will soon have another revolution. The present King is not at all fitted to govern such a nation. Mr. Shelley is in France.\* You will be surprised to find I am not with him; but times are altered, my dear friend, and tho' I will not tell you what has passed, still do not think that you cloud my mind with your sorrows. Every age has its cares. God knows, I have mine. Dear Ianthe is quite well. She is fourteen months old, and has six teeth. What I should have done without this dear babe and my sister I know not. This world is a scene of heavy trials to us all. I little expected ever to go through what I have. But time heals the deepest wounds, and for the sake of that sweet infant. I hope to live many years. Write to me often my dear friend you know not what pleasure your letters give me. I wish you lived in England that I might be near you. Tell me how you are in health. Do not despond, Tho' I see nothing to hope for when all that was virtuous becomes vicious and depraved. So it is—nothing is certain in this world. I suppose there is another where those that have suffered heavily here will be happy. Tell me what you think of this. My sister is with me. I wish you knew her as well as I do. She is worthy of your love. Now, dear friend, may you still be happy is the first wish of your ever faithful friend,

H. SHELLEY.

Ianthe is well and very engaging

XXI.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

*My dearest Mrs. Nugent,*

Your fears are verified. Mr. Shelley has become profligate and sensual, owing entirely to Godwin's "Political Justice." The very great evil that book has done is not to be told. The false doctrines therein contained have poisoned many a young and virtuous mind. Mr. Shelley is living with Godwins two daughters—one by Mary Wollstonecraft, the other the daughter of his present wife, called Clairmont. I told you some time back Mr. S. was to give Godwin three thousand pounds. It was in effecting the accomplishment of this scheme that he was obliged to to be at Godwins house, and Mary was determined to secure him. She is to blame. She heated his imagination by talking of her mother, and going to her grave with him every day, till at last she told him she was dying in love for him, accompanied with the most violent gestures and vehement expostulations. He thought of me and my sufferings, and begged her to get the better of a passion as degrading to him as herself. She then told him she would die—he had rejected her, and what appeared to her as the sublimest virtue was to him a crime. Why could we not all live together? I as his sister, she as his wife? He had the folly to believe this possible and sent for me, then residing at Bath. You may suppose how I felt at the disclosure. I was laid up for a fortnight after. I could do nothing for myself. He begged me to live. The doctors gave me over. They said 'twas impossible. I saw his despair. The agony of my beloved sister; and owing to the great strength of my constitution I lived, and here I am, my dear friend, waiting to bring another infant into this woful world. Next month I shall be confined. He will not be near me. No, he cares not for me now. He never asks after me or sends me word how he is going on. In short the man I once loved is dead. This is a vampire. His character is blasted for ever. Nothing can save him now. Oh! if you knew what I have suffered, your heart would drop blood for my miseries. When may I expect to see you? Do tell me, my dear friend, and write soon. Eliza is at Southampton with my darling babe. London does not agree with her. Will you enquire for a family of the name of Colthurst in Dublin? There is one son and daughter growing (?) up living with the mother. I want the direction, as I know them very well. Adieu, my dear friend, may you be happy is the best wish of her who sincerely loves you  
H. SHELLEY

23 CHAPEL STREET GROSVENOR SQUARE  
November 20th [1814].

\* Shelley eloped with Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin the previous month.

XXII.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*

Write very soon and tell me if you have received my last letter

*My dearest Mrs. Nugent,*

I have been confined a fortnight on Wednesday. Ianthe has a brother. He is an eight month's child and very like his unfortunate father, who is more depraved than ever. Oh my dear friend what a dreadful trial it is to bring children into the world so utterly helpless as he is, with no kind father's care to heal the wounded frame. After so much suffering my labour was a very good one, from nine in the morning till nine at night. He is a very healthy fine child for the time. I have seen his father: he came to see me as soon as he knew of the event; but as to his tenderness for me, none remains. He said he was glad it was a boy, because he would make money cheaper. You see how that noble soul is debased. Money now, and not philosophy is the grand spring of his actions. Indeed the pure and enlightened philosophy he once delighted in has flown. He is no longer that pure and good being he once was, nor can he ever retrieve himself. You will see us all in the Spring; I am about to come to Ireland, to get my boxes which are detained there. You shall then return with me to England, my dear friend, which you have often promised, and I will promise Mrs. Newman not to keep you any longer than you like to stay. God bless you, my dearest friend till we meet. Let me hear from you soon. Eliza sends her love to you, and Ianthe too. May you be happy is the first wish of her who loves you sincerely.

H. SHELLEY.

23 CHAPEL STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE

Decr. 11th [1814].

XXIII.—*Harriet Shelley to Catherine Nugent.*  
January 24th [1815].

*My dear Mrs. Nugent,*

I am sorry to tell you my poor little boy has been very ill. He is better now, and the first spare time I devote to you. Why will you not come to England, my dear friend, and stay with me? I should be so happy to have you with me. I am truly miserable, my dear friend. I really see no termination to my sorrows. As to Mr. Shelley, I know nothing of him. He neither sends or comes to see me. I am still at my father's which is very wretched. When I shall quit this house I know not. Everything goes against me. I am weary of life. I am so restrained here. That life is scarcely worth having. How I wish you were here. What will you do, my dear Catherine? Now those Newmans retire you will not like to go to another house of business. The few years you have to live may surely be passed more pleasantly. Do now make up your mind at once to come and stay with me. I will do everything to make you happy. For myself happiness is fled. I live for others. At nineteen I could descend a willing victim to the tomb. How I wish those dear children had never been born. They stay my fleeting spirit, when it would be in another state. How many there are who shudder at death. I have been so near it that I feel no terrors. Mr. Shelley has much to answer for. He has been the cause of great misery to me and mine. I shall never live with him again. 'Tis impossible. I have been so deceived, so cruelly treated, that I can never forget it. Oh no, with all the affections warm, a heart devoted to him, and then to be so cruelly blighted. Oh! Catherine, you do not know what it is to be left as I am, a prey to anguish, corroding sorrow, with a mind too sensitive to other's pain. But I will think no more. There is madness in thought. Could I look into futurity for a short time how gladly would I pierce the veil of mystery that wraps my fate. Is it wrong do you think, to put an end to ones sorrows? I often think of it—all is so gloomy and desolate. Shall I find repose in another world? oh grave, why do you not tell us what is beyond thee? Let me hear from you soon my dear friend. Your letters make me more happy. Tell me about Ireland. You know I love the green Isle and all its natives. Eliza joins in kind love to you. I remain your sincere but unhappy friend

H. SHELLEY

CHAPEL-STREET.

This is the last we have. It is impossible for any one, above all for an Irishman, to rise from a perusal of the foregoing letters without feeling overwhelming, if not indignant, sympathy with Harriet Shelley. They are the effusions of a sweet, true, confiding, noble nature. She committed suicide in November, 1816.

Catherine Nugent continued to live a member of the Newman household after Mr. Newman retired from business. My father, Richard Davis Webb, was admitted to her friendship while he was yet an apprentice to the printing business. She became one of his most intimate friends. He thus refers to her in two letters:

[November, 1826.] "William Allen [a distinguished member of the Society of Friends] is expected in town to-day, and Catherine Nugent is coming to meeting to see him. She is a wonderful woman—altho' very plain, little, and republican-looking."

[21st October, 1833.] "Catherine Nugent has amazing spring and elasticity of mind, as if her mind made her forget that she had a very weak body. When I remarked her great intellect, her uncommon quickness—her depth of charity and love of mankind—her utter absence of all personal selfishness—her quiet, unostentatious benevolence—her rapid glance at the true motives of people, and at the real bearing of any matters that come before her—I cannot help feeling a great degree of reverence for her and of attachment to her. Her greatest fault appears to be an unguardedness of language which makes her unscrupulous in her choice of words, so that she says unkind things now and then; but I look on this as a very small fault in estimating her character—though with many she would get off better with many an unamiable flaw in her manners and disposition. . . . [Others] . . . sink below contempt when compared with Catherine Nugent for natural abilities, wisdom in council, or powers of useful and improving conversation, or with Mary Newman in extent of accomplishment and information."

My recollections of Catherine Nugent are shadowy. I felt somewhat in awe of her. She died December 11, 1847, aged 76, and was buried with Mr. and Mrs. Newman in St. Anne's churchyard in this city, where Mrs. Hemans, the poetess, also lies. The grave is directly inside the door leading from Molesworth Street.

The Newmans' only child Mary was devotedly attached to Catherine Nugent. She adopted her niece Catherine L. Nugent. Possessed of ample means, they lived a most retired, reserved life, dreading publicity and availing themselves of few of the wider possibilities and advantages now afforded by money. I felt grieved many years ago when they told me they had destroyed most of Catherine Nugent's correspondence. Mary Newman, a sweet, amiable woman, passed away and was buried in Mount Jerome Cemetery. Catherine L. Nugent continued on in the old house whither the Newmans had retired, and in the midst of the old surroundings all unchanged.

The reference to Catherine Nugent in Mr. McCarthy's book surprised me. He evidently had not identified her. I had never heard of the Shelleys in connection with Catherine Nugent. I applied to her niece. Yes, her aunt had been intimate with them, but her aunt believed Shelley to have acted in such a way to his first wife that she could scarcely bear to think, much less to speak, of him. She could scarcely bear to hear his name mentioned. Miss Newman and she had found letters of Mrs. Shelley to her aunt which she meant to destroy. I persuaded her to let me see them and I carefully made copies.

Catherine L. Nugent now rests with her well-beloved friend, Mary Newman. No members of either family are known to be in existence. There is no reason why the letters should not be given to the public—it is due to

the memory of one whom most will believe to have been sorely wronged. It is probable the originals have been destroyed. If in existence, it may be some time before they are available.

ALFRED WEBB.

## Correspondence.

## JUDGE MATTHEWS'S SUCCESSOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wish, through the columns of the *Nation*, to contribute one suggestion to the discussion of the vacancy in the Supreme Court of the United States, the filling of which is of such vital importance to the proper organization of that tribunal. It seems to have become the settled policy of the national Executive to have a certain regard, within broad landmarks, for the geographical or sectional location of the various appointees. In so far as this idea rests upon the fact that the tone of men's thoughts is more or less affected by their surroundings, it seems to have met the approval of the great common sense of the people. It is a tradition, and, *me judice*, a correct one, that the Supreme Court of the United States should in a general way embody the prevailing intellectual spirit or temper or mode of thought of the four great sections of our country. But the South differs from the other three. There we find two different modes of thought. These two are widely divergent, not to say antagonistic. But one is in almost exclusive possession of the field, while the other is circumscribed within narrow limits. To obviate possible misunderstanding, and also to avoid going too much into details, I will say that the difference referred to does not involve any long-since exploded dogma of secession, but the various limitations of Federal and State jurisdiction in matters of municipal taxation, the powers of corporations under the inter-State-commerce clause, the enforcement of contracts with quasi-corporations, questions of inland navigation and bridge-building, the operation of the rights of citizenship and the delicate jurisdictional points that inevitably arise in this connection, the election laws in so far as they affect the election of Congressmen, etc. Of these two modes of thought (I can find no more accurately descriptive term than this), the South has a representative of one in Judge Lamar, but none of the other.

The President is credited with a desire to make Republicanism respectable in the South. In pursuance of this policy he has so far appointed only decent and competent men to office in the South. This is certainly true of Tennessee, not excepting his brother, who stands well. He is also credited with a desire to appoint only native Southerners to important offices. This he will not find an easy task in many parts of the South, if he confines himself to Republicans. But his policy itself is unquestionably correct, and it has already caused thoughtful men in the South to put on their thinking-caps. What strange and wonderful thing is this, that the old Federal carpet-bag rings who try to make as few as possible the number of stockholders in the Federal Patronage Company (limited) should be set aside for men without leprosy or spots!

The time seems ripe for the President to make a *coup*! There is one office which has, in only one instance, been considered the reward of partisan service. The successor to that exception is now to be appointed. The South is a fallow field for Republican proselytism. The prevailing tone in the South has its representa-

tive on the Supreme Bench in Judge Lamar. Why not make the other or Republican tone respectable by giving the South a permanent pledge that it is considered respectable by Northern and Western Republicans? Why not prove to ambitious young Southerners that Southern Republicanism opens the doors even to the highest preferment? Why not strengthen the Supreme Court itself and the Republican party in the South by taking a native Southerner, one identified with the South by blood and by education, an undeviating Republican, a man of strong and pure character, a judge of broad legal grasp and of approved experience, still in the very forenoon of his powers, and shake the South to the core by elevating him to the Supreme Bench?

In suggesting the name of Judge Eli Shelby Hammond, now Judge of the Western District of Tennessee, as such a man, I do not wish to be summarily dismissed and consigned to the limbo of the eager enthusiasts who are constantly writing letters and getting up petitions, soliciting the appointment of some local magnate to some monstrously big position, because said magnate is a fish of such uncommon size in the waters of Sixville or Seventown. Few of our Supreme judges have been famous outside of a circumscribed locality before their appointment, but all of them have won the approbation of the lawyers they met at the bar and of the judges before whom they practised. This is the enduring basis; and so much of fame, even in its highest degree, has been won by Judge Hammond. He is the only Southern Republican who, in my eyes, could be seriously mentioned for a place on the Supreme Bench; and apart from any idea he may represent, he is essentially fitted for the place.

He was born in 1838, in Mississippi, of Tennessee parents. He came to Tennessee when a boy. He received a careful classical education, and studied law at the then noted Lebanon (Tenn.) Law School. In 1859 he began the practice of law at Memphis. He supported Douglas in 1860. When the war began, he entered the Confederate Army, in which his record was that of a brave soldier and an efficient officer. For the last two years of the war he was one of Forrest's adjutants; the war over, he resumed the practice of law. He opposed Johnson and his "policy," became a member of the Republican party, and voted for Grant. He held then (and probably still holds) that the true solution of the so-called Southern question lies open to the South through affiliation with the Republican party. In 1878 he was appointed by Mr. Hayes to his present position. His character, his social standing, his ability, and his Republicanism have made him practically the centre of Southern judicial figures. On the bench he has remained the scholar, and the student both of law and of letters. He is probably the best equipped member of the Federal bench for the decision of all questions of Federal jurisprudence, that dark field of Eleusinian mysteries. For this he has received the recognition, not only of those with whom he has sat upon the bench, but particularly of Chief-Justice Waite. Nearly every copy of the *Federal Reporter* contains some one of his opinions. He has also had wide experience in matters of commercial law. Memphis, the largest town in his district, has the third largest purely commercial trade in the United States, the bulk of which is in four different States. Judge Hammond first rendered the opinion which decided the State Railroad Commissions unconstitutional, on the ground that they conflicted with the jurisdiction of Congress in matters of inter-State commerce. This position was afterwards sus-

tained by the Supreme Court. Judge Hammond handed down his opinion in the case of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company vs. Railroad Commission of Tennessee, reported in one of the *Federal Reporters*. I have not the reference by me.

In addition to his other qualifications, Judge Hammond is vigorous, young, being only fifty-one years old, and is not only a profound jurist, but also a man of broad views and ripe scholarship. He possesses also that calm equipoise and mental equilibrium which is the foundation-stone of the judicial temperament. From all standpoints, this is the proper, even the ideal, appointment. Perhaps the good judgment of the President may again exemplify the astonishment of the Frenchman at our good luck by putting Judge Hammond upon the Supreme Bench of the United States. Since this seems to be the day of pedigrees, I might add that Judge Eli Shelby Hammond has the best blood of Tennessee in his veins, including that of Eli Hammond, the famous old pioneer, the Harts of Transylvania fame, and Isaac Shelby, the Governor of Kentucky, and one of the heroes of King's Mountain. TENNESSEE.

MEMPHIS, TENN.

#### TARIFF REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It frequently happens that an inmate of a lunatic asylum imagines himself to be the only sane person, and that all the rest of the world has lost its senses. It is perfectly inconceivable to me that people cannot see that tariff reform is not a question of finance, but of politics. You never said anything truer than that "it is no easy task to make an interesting subject for popular instruction out of the Treasury decision on worsteds and woolsens." In fact, it is quite impossible to make the public understand or care for tariff reform, in itself, at all. The only thing they ever can or will care for is the one man or the half-dozen men who, in their eyes, represent tariff reform.

Consider how the whole matter stands. It is entirely in the hands of a Committee of Ways and Means in the House and another in the Senate. It would be too much to say that these can carry anything they want, but they can certainly prevent anything from being carried that they don't want. Consider again—and such "damnable iteration" must be excused for its importance—what these committees are. They are, at least as regards the House, appointed by the absolute will of the Speaker, and anybody who can make a Speaker can make a committee. In the Senate they differ only in being elected directly instead of through the intermediate agency of the Speaker. Again, the members come from local districts, say five per cent. of the whole country. They care nothing for the rest of the country, and the rest of the country cares nothing for them. Their single object is to satisfy the most powerful of their own constituents, with a reserve in favor of a similar class in other districts who can give full consideration in return. Add to this that their proceedings are perfectly hidden from public scrutiny.

Awaiting these committees, as soon as they are formed, is a perfectly organized and ever present lobby. Jay Gould is reported to have once said that he did not care to trouble himself about the election of members of the Legislature as it was so much easier to buy them afterwards. The protected interests know perfectly well where to apply their efforts, though they by no means despise the use of money in elections. It is not necessary to charge direct

bribery. There are hundreds of other ways in which human nature can be influenced, and it is safe to say that not one of them is unknown to the lobby. And now they have got a new weapon in the Treasury rulings. Thanks to the popular fetish of the separation of the executive and the legislature, the Treasury officials are just as irresponsible as the committees, and both are sinking deeper and deeper into the meshes of the lobby. The proceedings of Naval Officer Burt, which you set forth a while ago, show what may be looked for in this direction. Impunity is the most perfect manure for such a noxious plant. It is not what exists, so much as what we are coming to, which is the serious matter. Under these circumstances, what is the use of explaining to the public the wrongs of the tariff? Mr. Cleveland's message was probably as powerful an appeal to the country as, under the present system, can ever be made, yet it exploded as harmlessly as a simple charge of gunpowder. The case might be compared to a fortified castle filled with armed men, against which one should bring a vast undisciplined multitude and ask them to storm it without artillery. Till some means can be devised of overcoming the power of the lobby, all agitation for tariff reform is like the crackling of thorns under a pot.

What is this means? It is daylight instead of darkness, publicity instead of secrecy, personal responsibility in place of that diffusion of power which is only a cloak for intrigue, the putting forward the national interest in place of those of localities, the giving to the public interest at least an equal chance with that of private combinations. The Secretary of the Treasury is the only financial official who represents the whole country. It should be his right and his duty to expound on the floor of Congress what the country needs. In his position his little finger would be thicker than the loins of his opponents. He need not resign if defeated, he need not even at first make any definite proposition. A general statement would suffice to rally public opinion and lead gradually to more definite action. And with the demand the man would come who could put public opinion into shape. Sharp Treasury rulings would be impracticable, because they would be pounced upon by hostile critics, and officials would soon learn the danger.

Of course, the lobby and the committees would oppose this and see at once the danger to their schemes. For this reason, it cannot be done in or through Congress; it must be by outside agitation. If only some public man, tired and disgusted with the machinery at Washington, and eager for honorable distinction, would take the stump on this issue and throw himself upon the country, I believe he and everybody would be astonished at the reception he would encounter. G. B.

Boston, June 8, 1889.

#### THE CIVIL-SERVICE LAW NOT A FAILURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent, "G. B.," under date of June 1, in a letter published in the *Nation* for June 6, suggests that as "civil-service reform in this country has proved a failure," in his opinion, "notwithstanding the elaborate organization of the Civil-Service Commission," the only remedy is to have members of the Cabinet occupy seats in Congress, and be subject to questions from members.

It is well for civil-service reformers to know the advantages of having the power to compel appointing officers to answer questions regard-

ing their appointments, in public, and that power has been a great help to the reform in England—but it is also well to remember two points:

*First.* The elaborate organization of the Civil-Service Commission has not been a failure. The Commission's organization embraces only about one-fifth of all the Federal offices. The other four-fifths are wholly outside their rules, and all the pressure for office, all the rapid changes, and all the bad appointments occur among these four-fifths outside the pale of the Civil-Service Law. That this is so, see the Railway Mail Service. Up to May 1, when the system was at last put under the rules, the changes made for political purposes went on at a scandalously rapid rate. Since May 1, all has been tranquil, and there is no sign of pressure or politics whatever in that bureau. The testimony of officials whose offices have been included within the organization of the Civil-Service Commission is unanimous that as soon as the change was made, immediately they were relieved from pressure. A very striking illustration of the difference between that part of the service not under the rules and that which is included under them can be drawn from President Cleveland's Administration. In a little less than four years from the 4th of March, 1885, eighty per cent. of the offices not under civil-service rules had been changed, and during the same period the changes among those put in under civil-service examinations in the departments were only ten per cent., including deaths, resignations, and all. A close study of the facts makes it clear that the civil-service examinations have been a remarkable success, as far as they have been extended. *The only failure to accomplish the reform has been in those offices to which the civil-service rules have not been extended*—which seems to be an argument for extending those rules, not for abandoning them.

The *second* point is, that, in the English Parliament, though the power to question members of the Cabinet regarding appointments had existed for a long time, it was not till the examination system was established in its full force that the patronage system was abandoned. We have in the history of England the strongest evidence that the power to question the Cabinet is not alone sufficient to accomplish the reform of the civil service.

As in England, so with us, the examination system and the system of calling appointing officers to account publicly and easily would each aid the other. The examination system we have just begun with, and it should be extended and fortified. Just how to accomplish the other is a very grave question.—Yours, etc.

R. H. DANA.

BOSTON, June 10, 1889.

#### THE CENTURY DICTIONARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your recent review of the 'Century Dictionary' ought to be supplemented by some remarks upon its definitions of terms in physical science, while there is still time to make corrections. The definitions in question are, in many cases, insufficient, inaccurate, and confused in a degree which is really remarkable. Take, for example, the description of Ptolemy's 'Almagest,' "a book or collection of problems in astronomy and geometry, . . . so named by the Arabs because it was reckoned the greatest work on these subjects." Far from being a collection of problems, I doubt if there is a single problem in geometry or astronomy in the entire work. In no sense of the word is it a book of geometry, nor could it ever have

been considered as such. While thus giving an erroneous description, what the work really is—a system of astronomy based upon the doctrine that the earth remains immovable in the centre of the heavens—is entirely omitted. In a rapid glance through a portion of the published pages (A—Appet), I have noticed a number of other cases of insufficient, erroneous, or misleading definitions or statements. The definition of *albedo* is confused and misleading. That of *eccentric anomaly* is entirely wrong. *Absorption lines* are described as occurring just under the conditions when they are impossible. *Law of action and reaction* is accurate, with the exception of a sentence which is so far wrong that I suspect it to have been interpolated after the original article left the writer's hands. *Apochromatic* is insufficiently defined, and is illustrated by a quotation as unintelligible as could readily be found. *Ahidade* and *achromatic lens* contain misstatements less remarkable for their seriousness than for their existence.

So many defects in a single subject and in so small a fraction of the book would seem to indicate that the details of the work are not such as we should expect from the attention and care with which the editor and publishers have devised and executed their part of the plan. It ought to be added that, so far as I have noticed, the definitions in mathematics and mathematical physics are not subject to this criticism.

S. NEWCOMB.

WASHINGTON, June 8.

#### MORE HARD CASES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The "hard case" mentioned by "C. H. W." in the *Nation* of May 9 is not the only one of its kind. The failure of the Boston magazine, *Old and New*, left many of its contributors in the same wretched plight. At the time of the "failure" of *Old and New* the editor owed the writer of this letter \$150, and has utterly ignored all requests for payment as well as for the return of unpublished MSS. in his possession. He has never deigned to reply to a single letter on this subject, and does not seem to trouble himself about "the contempt of all honorable men."

E.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of the communication of "A Wretched Contributor," in No. 1248 of the *Nation*, I would like to state that I contributed to the *Manhattan* a negro character-sketch, which was published in the final issue of that magazine, but for which I never received one cent in payment, nor was it ever possible to obtain a word in reply to any letter I wrote.

Very respectfully,

ANOTHER WRETCHED CONTRIBUTOR.

MOBILE, ALA., June 3, 1889.

#### "TRY AND" ONCE MORE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Though my form of expression perhaps warrants Prof. R. L. Preston's objection, I think he will see that, to me at least, his example is only an apparent exception to the principle.

When I say that "with past tenses, *and* cannot take the place of *to*," I speak of tense-forms and not of tense-phrases. If "try and do" is thrown into past-tense forms, when *try* becomes *tried*, either *do* must become *did* or *and* must become *to*, with the differences of value I have set forth. *And-to* occurs only between root-forms.

In "Nor did Dobbin try *and* convince," "try," "convince," being infinitives, keep the root-form. It is true the complex is past, and it is perhaps adequate explanation to say that this is only an unconscious extension of a fixed formula; but, speaking more philosophically, "did try *and* convince" is a survival from a time when "did" was felt, not as a mere auxiliary, but as a distinct and separate act—a means towards an end—and "try," "convince," are thus "equally contingent" as regards "did," to which they are as truly future as they are to the leading verb in "he proceeded to try *and* convince."

CASKIE HARRISON.

THE BROOKLYN LATIN SCHOOL, June 7, 1889.

#### WAS WASHINGTON "AN EDUCATED MAN"?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the review of Justice Landon's 'Constitutional History and Government of the United States,' in last week's *Nation*, exception is taken to the author's statement that Washington was "not an educated man." The reviewer assumes that the statement is not only untrue, but ridiculously so. Justice Landon is nevertheless right and the reviewer wrong, if we accept the testimony of Jefferson, Marshall, Adams (J.), and Bancroft.

Jefferson ('Works,' vol. vi, 287) says: "His education was merely reading, writing, and common arithmetic, to which he added surveying at a later date. His time was employed in action chiefly, reading little, and that only in agriculture and English history." Chief-Justice Marshall ('Life of Washington,' page 1) says his education "was confined to acquisitions strictly useful, not even extending to foreign languages." Bancroft ('History of the U. S.,' vol. vii, p. 394) says: "He grew up without learning. Of arithmetic and geometry he acquired just knowledge enough to be able to practise measuring land, but his instruction at school taught him not so much as the orthography or rules of grammar of his own tongue." See also 'Works of John Adams,' vol. ix, p. 639.

Justice Landon's characterization of Washington, from which this one clause is selected for animadversion, is a fair example of much of his work. Permit me to give it:

"He [Washington] was a lucid writer, though not a debater, not an educated man, scarcely a general reader, not quick in perception; but in solidity of judgment, fairness of mind, dignity of character, and firmness of purpose, he was the ideal American. Take him all in all, alike what he was and was not, what he did and forebore to do, he is the greatest man in all our history."

The condensation is remarkable. Short as the whole is, I venture to think that careful criticism will discover it to be a very complete and just estimate of Washington.

MAURICE PERKINS.

UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y., June 3, 1889.

#### Notes.

WE are glad to learn from the *Academy* that the Cambridge University Press has now nearly ready for publication 'The Collected Papers of Henry Bradshaw,' the late University librarian, and a wonderful scholar. The book will be eagerly looked for, not only by those who knew the author of it, but by hundreds who only came to know about him after his lamented death.

The 'Reliques Scientifiques' of the late Prof. Arsène Darmesteter, of the Sorbonne, will be collected and arranged by his brother, Prof.

James Darmesteter of the Collège de France, and published by subscription in a limited edition by M. Charles Delagrave of Paris. These relics of a literary life too soon cut short will be arranged under three heads, namely, Jewish Studies, Franco-Jewish Studies, and French Studies. They are sure to contain very much which will be of the greatest interest to all students of the Hebrew language and literature, as well as of the French, and also to students of history and of language in general.

Other works of M. Arsène Darmesteter were left nearly ready for the press. Among them we note especially the French Dictionary upon which he spent many years of work, in collaboration with M. Adolph Hatzfeld. This will be published soon, we may hope. The 'Reliques' will make two volumes of about 700 pages in all, and will be accompanied by a portrait and a memoir.

Harper & Bros. will shortly issue 'Between the Lines, a Story of the War,' by Capt. Charles King, U. S. A.; and 'Uncle Peter's Trust,' a story for young people, by George B. Perry.

D. C. Heath & Co. will publish in September 'A German Reader for Beginners in School or College,' by Edward S. Joynes, editor of the 'Joynes-Meissner German Grammar.'

A third volume of the 'Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne,' edited by C. E. Doble, has just been issued from the Clarendon Press on behalf of the Oxford Historical Society—the diary having the greatest interest for graduates of that university, though its general literary curiosity and importance are far from inconsiderable. The present instalment is embraced by the two dates May 25, 1710, and December 14, 1712. Like its predecessors, it is separately indexed. There are three references to the late Samuel Pepys, all in his bookish capacity, as, for example, the entry of April 9, 1712: "He [Mr. Urry] hath got a Chaucer MS. from Mr. Pepys in which are some Fragments not printed. He hath another MSS. (which was borrow'd for him)," etc. There is a single mention of Milton: "Mich. Bolde translated Milton's Paradise Lost into Latin. 'Tis printed. I saw it at Mr. Urry's of Christ-Church, who hath also the first Specimen of it written by Bolde's own Hand.—Dr. Sloane," the entry (for June 9, 1712) continues, "hath an imperfect Copy of William Caxton's Ed. of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. . . . Caxton's Name does not appear. But, I think, there is no doubt of his being the Printer, the Letter agreeing with the other Pieces I have seen printed by Caxton." The references to Chaucer are numerous, but there is none to Shakespeare. There is hardly a page of this volume that does not afford entertaining reading.

Prof. F. G. Selby's edition of Bacon's Essays, published by Macmillan & Co., has been annotated for the use of Indian students, the author being one of the Faculty of Deccan College, Poona. It follows the last one that appeared in Bacon's lifetime (1625), and has the spelling modernized. The notes, for whose fulness apology is offered, should help make this attractive little volume a valuable adjunct in schools of different grades, for the teaching of rhetoric as well as for the forming of ideals.

From Mr. J. O. Austin, Providence, R. I., we receive a broadside of additions and corrections to that admirable work of his, the 'Genealogical Dictionary of Rhode Island.' It is of a proper size to be inserted in the volume. We hope to speak shortly of his no less admirable sequel to the Dictionary, viz., 'Ancestry of Thirty-three Rhode-Islanders.' As examples, in both conception and execution, these publications outrank any of recent years.

We lately made mention of the forthcoming

German Dictionary on the pattern of Webster announced by S. Hirzel, Leipzig (New York: B. Westermann & Co.). The first half-volume is now before us (*A-Ehe*), bearing the name of Moriz Heyne as editor. It fills 656 columns, of which there are two to a page (large octavo). The typography is well devised and clear, and the examples of literary usage cited are printed in the Roman character, thus affording a very agreeable rest to the eye in the search for definitions in the ordinary character. These quotations are a marked feature of the new 'Deutsches Wörterbuch,' and their source is precisely indicated. The etymologies, contrary to the American and English practice, do not precede but follow the main definition, and the eye misses the parentheses by which, with us, they are cut off from the rest of the article. Space is economized by omitting compounds *ad libitum*—as, for example, under *Anklage*, we find only *Anklagestand*, against this word and four others given in Thieme-Freusser; and also by making sub-titles of leading words—as (to take the same instance), the paragraph beginning with *Anklage* contains *anklagen*, *Angeklagte*, *Ankläger*, *Anklagestand*, *anklammern*, *Anklang*. That is to say, all the forms *Ankla-* are grouped together; but in the next paragraph the *Ankle*, *Ankli*, *Anklo*, and *Ankn-* are united, so that the practice seems somewhat arbitrary. The total number of words must be very much reduced; but in a manner which will not be objectionable to the Germans, for whom the Dictionary is intended, though foreigners will profit by it as well.

The 'Panorama of the Hudson,' published by the Bryant Literary Union of New York, is a remarkable attempt to show a continuous view of both shores of the river from New York to Albany, with the aid of photography and a mechanical process of engraving. The result is so great a success as to sound the knell of the ordinary panorama sold on the Hudson River boats. One plate is made to answer for both sides of the river, by giving the upper half to the west, and the lower (reversed like a reflection in the water) to the east, so that the album is by no means bulky. A white-letter inscription denotes the several places and points of interest on the way. The historical value of this Panorama will grow with time and the increase of settlements along the river.

Another historical souvenir is the May issue of *Sun and Shade* (Photogravure Co.), which records the scenes and incidents, by land and river, of the late Centennial celebration, with a particularly large group of portraits of the Governors of States, managers, etc., associated with the occasion, and a full selection from the trades tableaux. Mr. A. Wittemann also sends us an enlarged edition of his 'Instantaneous Scenes in the Centennial,' of which we have already spoken.

J. W. Bouton sends us three records of the current Paris Salon—one the regular octavo memorandum 'Catalogue Illustré,' with its cheap process cuts; a second the 'Salon de 1879,' first of twelve parts in quarto shape, with fine photogravures, and a text which opens with some curious details about the Salon of 1789, famous for David's exhibition of his 'Brutus'; and the third, Albert Wolff's 'Figaro-Salon,' folio, in which the plates are photolithographic (typogravure), and the parts issued in May and June are to be five. One may take his choice from this series, and easily get an idea of the physiognomy of the exhibition.

Mr. Archibald Grove is to edit for Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. the *New Review*, beginning on June 1. Lord Randolph Churchill, Senator Naquet ('boulangiste'), and Henry

James are among the writers for the first number, which is full of burning questions.

The second and last part of the Scientific Results of Dr. Wilhelm Junker's Travels in Equatorial Africa in 1880-85, containing the barometrical and meteorological observations, is published as a supplement to *Petermann's Mitteilungen*. It closes with an interesting account, by Dr. Bruno Hassenstein, of the methods of construction of his accompanying map, the two northern sections of which are given in this number. This veteran cartographer says that since the time of Barth no traveller has sent to the Perthes establishment geographical material so carefully prepared and so complete as Dr. Junker's. When on the march, he wears a coat of his own designing, with numerous pockets for his note-books, his watch and compass. From a button hang pencils of different colors—red for his route line, blue for the streams, and black for noting the time, direction of his course, and incidents. Throughout a journey of nearly four thousand miles he travelled entirely on foot, thus making his notes both more exact and more legible. On starting in the morning he would enter in a book, ruled especially for the purpose, the exact time of departure; and thereafter, at the end of every five minutes of actual marching, the direction by the compass in which he was going. He would also indicate by various signs the breadth and depth of streams and the direction of their currents, the character of the country, the apparent distance and height of any prominent object, the names of places, tribes, etc., as well as the readings of the aneroid and thermometer. At night these notes were carefully copied with pen and ink into a larger book; one page generally, sometimes two, being devoted to a day's march. So numerous were these various details that Dr. Hassenstein found it impossible to reproduce them all upon his map, although on a scale of 1:750,000.

The April and May numbers of the *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* contain little of general interest. The regulations for the reading-room of the Halle University library, given in the April number, read strangely to American librarians. In the May number W. Schultze begins what promises to be an interesting series of articles on the important part taken by the early Irish and Scottish monks in the preservation and propagation of mediæval science.

In the *Library* for May, F. Madan describes some curiosities of the Oxford Press, while the practical paper of the number is by Mr. Wright, the Plymouth librarian, telling how the board schools of that town were made to act as branches of the public library.

The Boston Public Library now puts forth its completed 'Index of Articles upon American Local History' in its historical collections, by A. P. C. Griffin. This very valuable work has been in progress for six years, and, as its title speaks for itself, we need only give one example, omitting the references:—Jamaica, L. I.: Annals, armed occupation, British occupations of the Presbyterian church, church matters, copies of town orders and resolutions from 1650 to 1660, history, inscriptions in the parish churchyard, letter from the Governor to the inhabitants; marriages, christenings, and burials; petition for land on Long Island, the Presbyterian church, proceedings against Quakers, rate list.

*Garden and Forest* for June 5 opens with a searching paper on the present condition of Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, as an illustration of the need of study of the ground by a competent landscape gardener before parks are laid out, and of the disaster that comes

from letting politics enter into the management afterwards.

The twenty-first annual meeting of the American Philological Association will be held at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., beginning Tuesday afternoon, July 9, 1889. The address of the President of the Association, Professor Thomas D. Seymour of Yale University, will be delivered on Tuesday evening. Members intending to be present are requested to send their names to Professor W. B. Owen (Easton, Pa.), Chairman of the Local Committee, as soon as possible. Those who propose to read papers are requested to notify the Secretary of the Association, Professor John H. Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., not later than Wednesday, June 26.

The establishment at Harvard of three new fellowships of an annual value of \$450 each supplies much-needed sinews to the graduate department of that University. Including the Robert Treat Paine Fellowship of Social Science founded last year, there are now twenty fellowships and twenty-eight scholarships at the disposal of the department. The total annual value of these foundations is \$16,500. If it were \$50,000, it could be judiciously disposed of among candidates of a high order. Appointments to two of the new fellowships—the Henry Lee Memorial of Political Science and the Ozias Goodwin Memorial of Constitutional and International Law—are still to be made for the coming year.

—We have the first official announcement of Clark University, Worcester, Mass. It tells us of the founder, Mr. Jonas G. Clark, and his desire "that the highest possible academic standards be here for ever maintained"; that special opportunities be offered for research, and that the instructors be left time for it. The Board of Trustees embraces many well-known names, and graduates from several New England colleges, whose work the new-comer is designed to supplement rather than duplicate. Dr. G. Stanley Hall has been chosen President. The University will open on October 2 with courses in Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, and Psychology, Dr. Hall himself taking the last-named professorship. His colleagues are as follows: Henry H. Donaldson (Yale, 1879), Assistant Professor of Neurology; Edmund Clark Sanford (California, 1883), Instructor in Psychology; Warren P. Lombard (Harvard, 1878), Assistant Professor of Physiology; F. Mall (Michigan, 1883), Adjunct Professor of Anatomy; Albert A. Michelson (U. S. Naval Academy, 1873), Acting Professor of Physics. Students are classed as "independent," candidates for the degree of Ph.D., special students not candidates for a degree, medical students, and preliminary students or undergraduates, which last must have spent at least two years in a college of good standing. Scholarships and fellowships have been provided by Mr. and Mrs. Clark, but more are desired. A central building and a chemical laboratory are already completed. Tuition fees will be \$200 per annum.

—The late meeting of the American Library Association was and was not a success. The Association was entertained by citizens of St. Louis with the most lavish hospitality. Every moment outside of the sessions was occupied in sight-seeing or receptions. The post-conference trip, too, was thoroughly enjoyed—the restful glide down the Mississippi, the prowls through the quaint streets of New Orleans, the home run through the picturesque mountainous region of Kentucky and Tennessee, and the stay at those booming cities of the new South, Nashville and Chattanooga, with a short emu-

lation of St. Louis hospitality at Cincinnati. So much for the pleasure; but the work of the Society was not so well done, for which the heat and still more the choice of the place of meeting were the cause. Half of the audience could hear with difficulty when the windows were closed, and could not hear at all when they were opened; and if they were kept closed, the heat made every one drowsy. In such conditions few felt in the mood for discussion. There were, as usual, too many reports and papers, but as there was no fixed programme, no discussion was cut off because the time for the next paper had arrived; the sparsity of talk was due simply to the hebetude of ideas. A more serious evil than the number of papers was their length. To prevent both evils in future, the suggestions have been made that hereafter an entire session be set apart for discussion alone, and that a twenty minutes' limit for papers be adopted and rigidly adhered to, speakers to be stopped in the middle of a sentence, if necessary. If to this be added the selection of a hall in which speakers can be heard, the Association might again have such a satisfactory meeting as it had at the Catskills. This will be assisted by the growing tendency to break up into sections. The State Librarians' Section was added this year to the Publishing Section. Next year a section for educational (*i. e.*, college and school) libraries will be instituted; after that, perhaps either the small town libraries will gain a chance to talk over their own wants and plans by themselves, unawed by the presence of librarians of a more extended experience, or the great libraries will retire to discuss their somewhat technical papers, leaving the more numerous little libraries to be the Association. One expects the great British Association to work in sections, but it is strange and it is interesting to an evolutionary student that even so small a society as this, whose membership has never exceeded two hundred, should be driven to differentiation.

—The first day was devoted to library architecture. The President, referring to his declaration at the Catskills that the architect is the natural enemy of the librarian, emphasized the distinction between use and beauty, and called upon architects to plan first for service and then to beautify, as the only way in which satisfactory work can be done. It might do, he said, for Bartholdi to design the shell of his statue, and then contrive a frame to hold the plates in place; but, as a living woman has other functions than to be beautiful, and her skeleton could not be designed simply to support her skin, so a library's plan should be made to further its vital functions, and not merely to impress or please the public with a fine elevation. He partly excused the general insufficiency of libraries to fulfil their purposes by the difficulty of reconciling use and beauty, but asserted that architects might have done better if they had given more thought to the problem. This called out from Mr. N. S. Patton, Secretary of the Western Association of Architects, an earnest declaration, not merely that the two, use and beauty, can always be reconciled, but that use is indispensable to beauty, and that it is the duty of the architect always to seek it first. The most noteworthy paper was indisputably that of Miss Mary S. Cutler, on the Sunday opening of libraries, a subject never before treated of in the Association. It was accompanied by valuable statistical tables, which report, among others, one town library that is open on Sundays only, that being the only day on which the outlying farmers all come to the centre of the town. In this

ease the church and the library work in conjunction more apparently than usual. The subject was treated dispassionately; the arguments for and against were given carefully and with impartiality; the conclusion reached was decidedly in favor of the opening in cities. The sentiment of the meeting was overwhelmingly in favor of Sunday opening. This might be connected with the religious opinions of the members (a census of the post-conference excursion showed 13 Unitarians in a party of 26), but the essayist and all but one of her defenders were not Unitarians. The same census, by the way, showed 10 Republicans, 10 Independents, 5 Democrats, and a woman-suffragist, and that 19 of the 26 came from New England, while 4 of the other 7 were born there.

—Another novel subject was treated in Mr. Bardwell's report on scrap-book making, a new occupation which eager librarians have found for their leisure moments. Mr. Bardwell's own library, the Brooklyn, has, we have heard, made great progress and found great use in such a collection; but we doubt whether many libraries can follow in that path unless their budgets are much increased. Among the other papers may be mentioned Mr. Green's exhaustive paper on the industrial work of libraries; Mr. Foster's careful statement of the uses of a subject-catalogue; Mr. Carr's report on charging systems—of great practical value; Mr. Bliss's clear report on classification; Mr. Bowker's on indexing portraits; and a lively talk by Mr. W. J. Gilbert of St. Louis, on the practical possibilities of indexing. There were no startling theories broached this year. But in the discussion of cataloguing rules, the address of President Cutter, and the paper of Mr. Linderfelt on Dziatzko's rules, were both in favor of modes of entry favoring popular ignorance in opposition to the more scholastic and theoretically consistent practice of the British Museum, which has hitherto been generally adopted by the American libraries—in favor, that is, of entry under much-used pseudonyms in place of the real name, under the titles of British noblemen by which they are known, instead of under the family name by which they are not known, and under the best-known instead of under the last name of a married or divorced or remarried woman. The next meeting will be in the White Mountains or on Lake George, under the Presidency of Mr. F. M. Crunden of St. Louis.

—A most curious and interesting relic of Dutch Christianity in Formosa has come to light from the library of the University of Leyden and the press of Messrs. Trübner & Co. of London. It is the Gospel of St. Matthew, translated into Formosan (Sinkang dialect) by the Dutch domine, Daniel Gravius, who labored as missionary in the island from 1647 to 1651. During the flourishing days of the Dutch republic, an extensive missionary work was carried on by ministers and schoolmasters from the Netherlands, during a period of thirty-seven years, with cheering success. Unfortunately, however, the good work was suddenly arrested by the murderous onslaught of the famous Chinese pirate Coxinga. Born of a Chinese father living at Nagasaki, and a Japanese mother, this pirate made himself the scourge of the Eastern seas. After devastating the coast of China during the decline of the Ming dynasty, and having been twice refused by the Japanese Government men, ships, and orders to invade China, he cast his eye on the feeble Dutch colony on Formosa. He slaughtered most of the Hollanders (though from Japanese sources we know that some of the Dutch men, women, and children were living

as prisoners as late as 1711), and the mission thus came to an end. The Rev. William Campbell, an English missionary now of the flourishing Presbyterian mission among the Chinese at Taiwan Fu, suspecting that the version made by Gravius of the New Testament might be in existence, went to Holland, and, after a long search, aided by the learned men, discovered the Gospel of St. Matthew in parallel columns of Dutch and Formosan, with the bilingual preface of the translator. Messrs. Trübner have reprinted this interesting work in a handsome square volume, which may serve as a basis of a new translation for use among the aborigines who dwell apart from the Chinese, still unconquered, in this latest organized province of the Chinese Empire. With the English version at the bottom and the Dutch at the side, one need not be a Psalmanazar in order to get some idea of the structure of Formosan, which apparently belongs in the group of "agglutinative" languages in use from Borneo to Kamchatka.

## ROMANES'S MENTAL EVOLUTION IN MAN.

*Mental Evolution in Man: Origin of Human Faculty.* By George John Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. D. Appleton & Co. 1889.

DR. ROMANES'S writings are beginning to excite a very special interest among readers of psychological literature.\* The volume before us is the third in perhaps the greatest continuous and systematic psychological labor ever proposed. The preceding volumes were entitled 'Animal Intelligence' and 'Mental Evolution in Animals.' The remainder of the series are to treat of 'Mental Evolution in Man.' The present book deals with the "Origin of Human Faculty" by the method of comparative psychology. Future instalments will take up the natural history of Intellect, Emotions, Volition, Morals, and Religion. The author proposes for himself the task of filling up the gap between the human and animal mind, and to trace the stages of mental development from the lowest life up to the highest. He is eminently a scientific and constructive psychologist.

The fundamental position is thus stated:

"In the present treatise I take as granted the general theory of evolution, so far as it is now accepted by the vast majority of naturalists. That is to say, I assume the doctrine of descent as regards the whole of organic nature, morphological and psychological, with the one exception of man. Moreover, I assume this doctrine, even in the case of man, so far as his bodily organization is concerned; it being thus only with reference to the human mind that the exception to which I have alluded is made. And I make this exception in deference to the opinion of that small minority of evolutionists who still maintain that, notwithstanding their acceptance of the theory of descent as regards the corporeal constitution of man, they are able to adduce cogent evidence to prove that the theory fails to account for his mental constitution" (p. 390).

He proceeds under the assumption of the general validity of the argument made in his previous work, 'Mental Evolution in Animals,' and carries into human psychology the principles he applied in explaining the animal:

"I desire to show that in the one province, as in the other, the light which has been shed by the doctrine of evolution is of a magnitude which we are now only beginning to appreciate; and that by adopting the theory of continued development from the one order of mind to the other, we are able scientifically to explain the whole mental constitution of man, even in those parts of it which, to former generations, have appeared inexplicable" (p. 1).

Man's living nature is identical in kind with the nature of all other life, and "the human mind itself is but the topmost inflorescence of one mighty growth whose roots and stem and many branches are sunk in the abyss of planetary time." This is the new point of view contributed to philosophy by the young science of biology.

The thesis propounded is established as follows: It is improbable on *a priori* grounds that the process which has been "elsewhere so uniform and ubiquitous should have been interrupted at its terminal phase." Again, the human mind, within its own career of development, "begins at a zero level of mental life and may culminate in genius," but never experiences any sudden leaps of progress. Then, too, in its own lower phases, the human mind passes through the very stages which the lower forms of consciousness pass through—a phenomenon which is not a chance coincidence. Lastly, "in the history of the race—as recorded in documents, traditions, antiquarian remains, and flint implements—the intelligence of the race has been subject to a steady progress of gradual development." Evolution, therefore, acted from the beginning up through the anthropoid apes, and, if it there broke off, it began again with the primitive man and has been uninterrupted since. To admit any such break in the principle of nature is to violate the law of *continuity*, the grandest which science has developed.

To appeal to special characteristics—Romanes holds that if the Emotions of the animals be compared with those of man, they will be found in great measure coincident. He believes that in his 'Mental Evolution of Animals' he has given "unquestionable evidence" that they possess all the human emotions, except those of the moral sense, religion, and the sublime. This parallelism (especially as applied to the childhood of man) strongly implies genetic continuity. Again, the Instincts having reference to nutrition, self-preservation, reproduction, and the rearing of progeny, are the same and act the same in man as in the creatures below him. In Volition, the human surpasses the brute in complexity, refinement, and foresight, but not in kind. And so finally in Intellect, though there is enormous difference, it is not one of kind, but simply one of degree. Up to a certain point, the correspondence is complete. In a tabular frontispiece to the book, Dr. Romanes has exhibited the parallelism of psycho-genesis in man and animals, indicating in a suggestive way the points in the scale in which new tendencies and faculties first appear.

The only distinction which he thinks can be properly drawn between human and brute psychology is that man has the power of abstraction, the ability of making "general ideas." On this he quotes Locke with essential agreement. By "general idea" he means, with other psychologists, the idea which comprises the resemblances between, for example, the various individual men, without regard to their individual differences. The idea of any special man is a percept; that of the class Men, a concept. He borrows a simple illustration from Galton: the difference is like that between the photograph of a particular person and the composite photograph of a large num-

ber. As the latter exhibits the characteristics common to all, so "the sensitive tablet of memory" fuses into a single conception the many single images obtained by many sense-perceptions. Again, as, in the case of the composite photograph, only those objects which present numerous points of resemblance can be blended into a distinct picture, so, in the case of thought, only those images which are distinctly similar will blend in single conception or class-representation.

Our author believes a more careful classification of the kinds of ideas to be necessary. Without this, neither the difference between the animal and human mind nor the development of the latter will be understood. The word "idea" is "a generic term to signify indifferently any product of imagination, from the mere memory of a sensuous impression up to the result of the most abstruse generalization." He points out three distinct types: Memories of Sensuous Perceptions, Recepts or Generic Ideas, and Concepts or General Ideas. These include, in natural order of development, all the various sorts which writers have pointed out. The term "Recept" is one that Romanes invents to designate a class of ideas which he believes not to have been clearly distinguished. In his chapter on the "Logic of Recepts" the difference between recepts and concepts is more clearly shown. The one is received, the other conceived. The one is a passive generalization, the other an active, intended one. The one is made with little or no consciousness of the mental phenomenon, the other only when the effort is definite in consciousness. In one the idea carries with it, or consists of, an image; in the other there is never an image. He quotes passages from Taine, Sully, Perez, Mill, Mansel, Noire, and Huxley to show that this is a distinction recognized, though its significance is not understood.

Now, it is this higher kind of ideation, the formation of concepts, which in Dr. Romanes's opinion makes the essential distinction between the human and the brute mind. The important question is, whether between Recept and Concept there is a difference in kind or only a difference in degree. On the settlement of this depends the settlement of the origin of man's mental powers. If there is a difference in kind, then some other origin than an animal ancestry must be sought for the human mind. If the difference is shown to be only one of degree, then in man's mental relations he is no less kin to the lower kingdoms than in his physical.

The formation of ideas among animals is carefully examined and illustrated in a comparison with those of the simplest human ideation exhibited by the child and the savage. Romanes cites the case of the chimpanzee in the Zoölogical Gardens whom the keeper and he himself have educated to designate correctly groups of objects up to five. Then there is the notion of causation indicated by so many creatures, as, *e. g.*, cats learning to ring and knock for admission, and the numerous imitative acts of monkeys. (See his 'Animal Intelligence,' which is a storehouse full of such instances.) Such acts show that not only all men, but most animals likewise, have a "generic idea of causality, in the sense of expecting uniform experience under uniform conditions." All this, however, is within the limits of what Romanes has designated as the sphere of Recepts. He would not insist that the division, though clear, is sharply defined; for not only are remembered Percepts observed to blend gradually into rudimentary Recepts, but the highest and most complex Recepts in turn become the simplest Concepts.

\* His home is now in London, though he was born at Kingston, in Canada (1848). His education has been extensive. The earlier stages were conducted by tutors and in private schools in London, France, Germany, and Italy. The collegiate part was furnished by Cambridge University, from one of whose colleges he graduated in 1870, taking honors in Natural Science. While still in college he became an intimate friend of Charles Darwin. From the first he has been an ardent evolutionist, and has written much on subjects in natural history and biology. The work entitled 'A Candid Examination of Theism, by Physicus' is likewise attributed to him. Within a few years his energies have been largely directed to questions connected with psychology.

In the sphere of Concepts the images of Percepts and Recepts are left behind. This dry and difficult subject is treated with unusual freshness. It is clear that it has been thought out and its difficulties perceived. A Concept has no remembered thing as its basis. Such ideas as color, labor, etc., are abstractions, only possible through language. A word in such cases is taken as a mental equivalent of such ideas as previously rested on images, actual or remembered. Generic ideation has "stored the mind with a rich accumulation of orderly ideas, grouped together in many systems of logical coherency" before language appears. Language takes up this work of grouping. It names the Generic Ideas (or Recepts) and thus builds the "Lower Concepts." These are general as contrasted with generic. On this basis the "Higher Concepts" are developed. Each higher, all the way, is born out of the lower. From the start the essence of the idea has been to classify; but in the Receptual order it is automatic, in the Conceptual order it is introspective.

The syntax of Gesture language is discussed on the basis of the authority of Tylor and Dr. Scott. Nothing specially new is added, but the significance of the whole in a scheme of the development of human faculties is pointed out, viz., that in it the stage of Recepts is reached, but ideas of any high abstraction are never expressed. Animals have the germs of language in tones, gestures, etc. They make these not only from natural impulse, but also through conventional arrangement. (Numerous cases are cited and references made to 'Animal Intelligence'.) Again, animals possess to some extent the powers of articulation, the next higher stage in the development of expression. Some of them—in common with infants, savages, and idiots—articulate by way of meaningless imitation. The next stage, spontaneous or instinctive exercise of articulate powers in meaningless sounds, occurs in young children, in uneducated deaf-mutes, and in idiots, but is too high a stage for animals.

The understanding of tones of the human voice extends at least through the entire vertebrata, but that of words and phrases only to the highest species. The best examples are those of dogs and apes. The very remarkable understanding of the chimpanzee in the Zoological Gardens of London is again cited (p. 126). This higher excellence of receptual capacity through the hearing of articulate words is a fact of the largest significance. It proves a parallelism in the sharing of certain faculties of mind. This faculty of word-comprehension is on the very border of that of intelligent word-using. The difference, then, between man and these animals in respect to these parallel psychological faculties relates only to their mode of expression. It is an anatomical and not a psychological one, depending solely on a difference in structure of the vocal organs.

The parallelism is made more complete in the case of animals which learn to articulate and to understand what they say. Curious cases are quoted of parrots and starlings calling persons and animals by name, asking for favors, scolding, saying greetings and farewells, etc., with unerring precision. Though these all have their basis in the principle of association, and are very automatic, yet they are of the same sort as the human as far as they go. It is exactly in this manner, by these impulses, and along these lines of association, that children do their first talking.

A point of interest in this comparison is, that while this child and animal talk is so largely imitative and onomatopoeic, there is yet observed "a fertile tendency to the invention of

words wholly arbitrary." In some children this has gone so far as the invention of a whole language for themselves. Cases, well corroborated, are cited from Horatio Hale and Dr. Hun. A pair of twins in a Boston suburb developed a language of their own. They refused to utter a syllable of English—not even "papa" or "mamma." They "passed the days, playing and talking together in their own speech, with all the liveliness and volubility of common children." After making many comparisons (drawn from deaf-mutes) between thought as expressed in gesture and as expressed in words, our author comes to the conclusion that, "in the absence of articulation, the human race would not have made much psychological advance upon the anthropoid apes" (p. 151).

The work contains a most interesting chapter on the development of Self-Consciousness. "Self-consciousness consists in paying the same kind of attention to internal or psychical processes as is habitually paid to external or physical processes—a bringing to bear upon subjective phenomena the same powers of perception as are brought to bear upon the objective" (p. 195). Now, it is claimed that animals know something of mental operations, but this comes from their observation of it in other animals; "they recognize a world of ejects as well as objects: mental existence is known to them ejective, though, as may be allowed, never thought upon subjectively." This "ejective origin of subjective knowledge" is a point of noteworthy importance: it is a sort of "outward self-consciousness," common also to man, which does not penetrate to the contemplation of subjective mental processes. In the young child, this consciousness includes its own body as among the world of objects. Prof. Preyer relates, "that his boy, when more than a year old, bit his own arm just as though it had been a foreign object." Of course this is a stage much below that of Buffon's parrot or many of the adult animals, who distinguish their own organism from other objects and associate this with their own mental states. Even after the child begins to talk, he speaks of himself "by his proper name, or in the third person." The child's rudimentary designation of itself as subject is first shown in the third year. This stage of consciousness corresponds to the pre-conceptual stage of judgments. But before this it has shown the capacity to make simple receptual judgments on objects about it. This it states in words, just as the animal does in gestures or vocal signs. From this on it strips the animal because of its more efficient system of sign-making, its being surrounded socially by the medium of speech, and its strongly inherited propensity to communicate perceptions and desires by signs. Add to these "the expressions of affection, sympathy, praise, blame, etc., on the part of others, and the feelings of emulation, pride, triumph, disappointment, etc., on the part of the self," and we have the principal influences tending to impress upon the growing child the sense of personality. Like the development of the embryo before birth, the process is gradual, is a growth. Finally, it undergoes a leap of progress analogous to that of the birth of the body. "Midway between the gradual evolution of receptual ideation and the no less gradual evolution of conceptual, there appears to be a critical moment when the soul first becomes detached from the nutrient body of its parent perceptions, and wakes up in the new world of a consciously individual existence."

In the latter half of the book much space is devoted to the evidence which language has to contribute to the theory of the gradual de-

velopment of mental faculty. Here, in the etymology of words and in the buried relationships of languages, is an "unintentional record of the prehistoric progress of ideation." Comparative philology has conclusively shown that language did not appear ready-made, but is the result of gradual evolution. After discussing the types, explaining the methods and principles of classification, exhibiting the process of evolution, etc., the conclusion is reached that languages become simpler in structure, poorer in ideas, more physical in conceptions, *i. e.*, they exhibit a more and more receptual ideation the further they are traced back in their history, until finally their "roots" only are left by the analysis. Here the genealogy becomes further impossible. Help must be looked for from other quarters. Growth during the period in which they can be traced is presumption that growth preceded the point at which investigation is impeded, until finally a time is reached when there was no language.

The conclusion is, that psychically, "the whole distinction between man and brute resides in the presence or absence of self-consciousness." Dr. Romanes has all the way been concerned with "the question whether we have here to do with a distinction of kind or of degree—of origin or of development" (p. 430). He believes himself to have abundantly proved the latter. "If we already accept the theory of evolution as applicable throughout the length and breadth of the realm organic, it appears to me that we have positively better reasons for accepting it as applicable to the length and breadth of the realm mental" (p. 437).

It must be remarked that Romanes seems to us to lay too much stress on the difference between the self-consciousness of man and that of the animals. Some animals have the power of forming and communicating ideas; *i. e.*, they use "intentional signs." It may be much of a question how they can intentionally convey their ideas if they are not aware of them to some extent as the ideas which they have. Some degree of real self-consciousness is difficult to withhold from them.

The author would have served his readers better, had he given more attention to an analysis of the book. The titles of the seventeen chapters are brief and blind; the reader has no knowledge of what is coming. This is the more important because the book is too long (452 pages) for its matter. The style is redundant and prolix. Any who will read and appreciate it, would understand it just as well and appreciate it much better, had the writer practised the grace of brevity. In an age of so many claims, men who would be gladly read should learn to write short. It would appear as though this tendency had its roots in a certain polemic attitude which runs through the work. Dr. Romanes assumes himself to be writing against some one. No doubt he is; but the interest of truth (which is the highest aim) would be better served were there less of this belligerent animus. The coolest and most discriminative judgment is not a natural outgrowth of such polemic emotion. Besides, these occasions a certain unpleasant consciousness of personality relating to what he "will proceed" to do, whether his "opponents will find it easy to meet" him, and what he "fearlessly invites them to do," etc. Though we heartily dissent from this fighting posture in which the argument is all the way conducted, yet it must be admitted that he has given his "opponents" a great task. It is not probable that the case as presented by Dr. Romanes will be accepted as established, but to him is due the credit of

making the best explanation thus far from the side of natural development.

The age-long riddle regarding "general ideas," which has so puzzled Vedanists, Platonists, Scholastics, and German Idealists, receives here the most masterly and lucid explanation yet given. Some new terms have been invented to express most careful distinctions. Though at first, perhaps, a little confusing, they are indispensable, and will probably retain a place in psychological terminology. No student of psychology can afford to dispense with this rich, learned, elaborate, and latest contribution to his subject. And not only will those interested in problems of psychology find here substantial help, but students of biology, philology, and anthropology will be repaid for the time they spend with this book. Dr. Romanes is doing an indispensable work. The succeeding parts of his undertaking will be awaited with unusual interest.

#### BONVALOT'S HEART OF ASIA.

*Through the Heart of Asia: Over the Pamir to India.* By Gabriel Bonvalot. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 2 vols., pp. 281, 249.

IN the autumn of 1880, M. Gabriel Bonvalot and his friend Capus, moved partly by a desire to collect specimens of natural history, and much more, we imagine, by a love of adventure, undertook a journey in Central Asia, which lasted until February, 1882. Going through Siberia as far as Omsk, and thence to Vierny, they went straight on to Tashkent. They made a tour in Khokand, visited Samarcand and the upper valley of the Zaraf Shan, and from Karshi made a trip to Kilif and Shirabad on the Oxus. The return journey went through Bokhara, Khiva, and across the Ust-Urt to Krasnovodsk on the Caspian. The account of this journey, which was published in two volumes in 1884-'5 under the title of 'En Asie Centrale,' is light, pleasant reading, but very superficial—chiefly the story of the travellers' adventures, the most possible being made out of very trivial incidents. One catches glimpses of native life and civilization, and one gleams some facts relating to the course of trade with India, Russia, and other countries. But we look in vain for what we expected to find—interesting details about the natural history of the country. Nothing whatever, or almost nothing, is said about the effects of Russian rule, or about politics.

The same faults might be found with the volumes before us, except with the preface, to which we will recur. The journey here described is more interesting than the preceding one, because it takes the reader over new ground, and because the adventures are worth telling. Bonvalot and Capus, accompanied by an artist friend, Albert Pépin, who has contributed 250 illustrations to the book, left Marseilles in February, 1886 (curiously enough, the author, although very particular about months and days, does not mention the year), and speedily arrived, by way of Constantinople, at Tiflis. From one of the stations on the railway to Baku they rode to Teheran, suffering many detentions from bad weather, swollen rivers, and inundated roads. Thence they went to Meshed, and then, by Sarakhs, to Merv, where they saw the building of the Russian town and the entry of the first railway train. Here they stayed for a month, hoping to penetrate into Afghanistan by the Kushk valley, until they found that a Russian scientific expedition had been turned back; then, planning to go by Andkhov—a scheme which also fell through—and finally visiting General Komaroff at Askabad. As the

railway was finished no further, it was necessary to cross that desert, once so deadly, on camels and horses to Tchardjui, where they struck their old road to Bokhara and Samarcand. After resting and refitting, the travellers went to the Oxus by the way of Karatag, Hissar, and Kabadian, and crossed the river with the intention of going to Balkh, and then making their way to India as best they could. They were, however, detained in honorable captivity by the Afghans at Shur-Tépé until instructions could be had from Cabul, and were then sent back across the Oxus, after being told that if they crossed it again without proper permission, it would be at the risk of their lives. To their surprise, the Afghan Mirza who had charge of them spoke excellent and fluent Russian.

It was already December when they got back to Samarcand, and, as usual in such cases, the checks which they had met with only heightened their ardor for going on. General Korolkoff suggested to them to try and reach India by Kashgar, or even by the Pamir, which no one had ever attempted to explore in winter. They had already thought of this, and therefore made all their preparations and went to Ush, at the extreme east of the province of Khokand, still undecided which route to take. After all the information to be obtained on the spot, they decided to try the Taldyk pass, the plateau of the Alai, and the Pamir. The season was late, and more snow than usual had fallen; but, in spite of dangers from famine, cold, deep snow, and avalanches, and of plots laid for them by Kara-Kirghiz, Chinese, and Afghans, they reached Sarhad on May 7, just two months after leaving Ush. Here they were again detained by the Afghans; but, as soon as their horses had recovered their strength, they started off without waiting for permission, crossed the Hindu-Kush mountains without a guide, and reached Mastudj in the petty independent country of Tchatral. The usurping Metar of Tchatral, who had committed every possible crime, refused to let them go on without an order from the Indian Government, and Capus and Pépin were forced to go to Tchatral to make him a formal visit, in accordance with what was claimed to be invariable custom, while Bonvalot remained behind at Mastudj for forty-five days until letters arrived from the Viceroy. Meanwhile, fears were entertained in Europe that the travellers had been murdered. More fortunate than some others, the Viceroy's orders opened the road for them to Ghilghit and Kashmir, and, after a short stay in Simlah, they got back to France at the end of September, 1887.

It may be as well to say for the benefit of the reader that M. Bonvalot writes in a lively, readable style, that he possesses the endurance, pluck, and patience necessary for an Eastern traveller, and that he does not lay undue stress on his dangers, difficulties, privations, detentions, and annoyances.

In his preface the author calls attention to the manner in which Russia assimilates her conquests by quickly admitting conquered populations—for instance, the Turcomans—to the rights of Russian subjects, and by giving them hopes for the future by employing them in the military and civil service. He recognizes, what all travellers in Central Asia have seen, that the Russians have come there to stay, and that there is no danger of their being turned out by any rising of the native population, even if supported by foreign intrigue and money. With the English it is different. Bonvalot says:

"They have not the same security as those who descend, from the west, the historical

slope which leads to the countries governed by them. They have not the same confidence in the future, the same carelessness as to the morrow. The English endeavor to put back the hour for playing the game of which they will have to provide the stakes. They cannot afford to make a single false move, and those who are at the helm keep their eyes and ears open; the least thing startles them. They display admirable tenacity, intelligence, and activity. I would compare them, without wishing to speak disrespectfully, to the Chinese conjurer who keeps twenty plates twirling in the air at the same time. . . . Nevertheless, their power, whatever they may say, is more or less artificial; they are making their way up stream, which tires the boldest swimmer, whereas the others are following the current, which is far easier."

While detained at Tchatral the travellers had plenty of time to cross-question the natives. These, ten years ago, only troubled themselves about the English, but are now interested in the Russians, who, from the information brought by the pilgrims, are poor, but have a great many soldiers.

"The Russians are thought to be made of better stuff throughout all Asia, and as their finances do not admit of their indulging in the prodigalities of the Anglo-Indians, the people are more struck by their military power, while with the English it is the depth of their purse which creates so much surprise. The peoples and tribes surrounding India have got to think that they have only to stretch out their hand to those who govern the country, and they are always surprised when they do not receive anything. It is easy to see by the way in which they ask, that they consider themselves entitled to largesses, and they regard the English not as mighty warriors, but as very rich merchants who have built up the edifice of their power upon piles of rupees, than which nothing could be more fragile. They fully recognize the courage of the English; they admire their wonderful public works, their fine railways; and yet they keep their eyes fixed on the Russians, and expect something good out of them. It is difficult to win the gratitude of Asiatics, and to satisfy them; and even those of India are not satisfied. I don't know what they expect to get out of a change, and they are perhaps as childish in this respect as certain other nations. But all I know is that many a discontented Hindu says: 'When the Russians are here, things will be different.' When will they be in India, or will they ever be? I am not competent to answer these questions, not knowing what the future has in store; but I do know that their coming is eagerly awaited by not a few, and that a great many expect to see them arrive."

An explanation of this state of unrest may perhaps be found partly in the vagaries of Eastern imagination, and partly in the fact that Orientals are accustomed to a régime of individual liberty, with freedom to practise all the rites required by their religion, and to keep to the old customs and habits of their several races—a régime tempered by occasional acts of despotism and severity. This sort of government the Russians know well how to provide, and they are at the same time comparatively free from any prejudices of race, caste, or color. The English, on the other hand, besides their race prejudices and their want of sympathy with the natives, have a stronger feeling of their moral duty as a government, and try to bring their subject peoples under the strict rule of law and legality—a process which causes discontent.

*The Primitive Family in its Origin and Development.* By C. N. Starcke, Ph.D., of the University of Copenhagen. [International Scientific Series.] D. Appleton & Co. 1889.

DR. STARCKE has evidently studied very carefully modern authors and authorities on the subject of his work, but he is deficient in the knowledge of older sources, which possess the great value of containing the statements of eye-witnesses concerning a state of things that

has been greatly modified since, and in many instances has almost disappeared. Their explanation of it may be utterly false, but we ought to know and critically examine what they report as having seen or learned at first hand. Our author is quite deficient on this point, for reasons not discoverable by us. But it is certain that he has overlooked the numerous evidences of descent in the female line among the Caribs, the positive traces of its former existence among the Nahuatl of Central Mexico, the Peruvian *ayllu* or clan, so distinctly found among the Incas of Peru. Mere omission to mention them is very pardonable; but the assertion, in the case of the Mexicans, that such traces "do not exist," is less to be excused.

Our author appears to be rather confused in regard to the true nature of the clan. This is not surprising if we take into consideration that he evidently has not had opportunity of witnessing the working of the institution *in situ*. He furnishes, in this respect, another evidence of the fact, which grows more and more patent, that ethnology is dangerous ground to tread for any one who has not lived with at least one primitive people for some length of time. It is interesting to notice that Dr. Starcke feels, without knowing it, that the religious organization of primitive nations is apt to give a misleading appearance to their sociology. The clan is independent of and anterior to it, as an institution, yet the two coexist without clashing. As long as that organization is not fully studied and explained, there will always be a number of hypothetical explanations offered for many features which, in fact, are of the greatest simplicity in themselves, and quite easily understood by him who is practically acquainted with the matter through long experience. In the old controversy between Morgan and McLennan, Dr. Starcke endeavors to be fair, at least. Here again his lack of personal acquaintance with Indians, for instance, prevents him from seeing things in their natural light. The controversy is not advanced a step by all that he says about it.

Otherwise, the book, as a specimen of honest "learning" alone, deserves commendation; but the time for theorizing in the field of ethnology is rapidly passing away, even in such portions as are most obscure, like the Primitive Family question. There is enough opportunity left for truly scientific study of the matter. Instead of elaborate compendiums from a theoretical standpoint, the friends of ethnology had better imitate the example of Morgan, and go and see for themselves before writing about it.

*Shakespeare.* Par James Darmesteter. Paris: H. Lecène & H. Oudin. 1889.

It would doubtless be too much to say that a

serious Frenchman is the only tolerable "serious" person on the face of the earth, but it is hardly too much to say that he is an admirable person, and valuable in France in proportion to his rarity. One of the best Frenchmen of this type, Prof. Darmesteter of the Collège de France (who, unhappily, needs no longer to be distinguished by his given name), has undertaken to introduce Shakspeare to his countrymen in a new volume of the "Collection des Classiques populaires." It seems to us that M. Darmesteter has done his work extremely well. He gives a brief outline of Shakspeare's life, and then, passing almost dry-footed over the poems, takes up the plays. These he treats simply, avoiding all minute criticism, translating passages and scenes, and connecting them by the story of the drama, told cleverly and very briefly. It is probably true that these are the very best translations of Shakspeare into the French that ever have been made. They are for the most part graceful and accurate, and sometimes they succeed in showing in their new dress not only Shakspeare's meaning, but also something of his style. We have no space for quotations, but the scene between *Lorenzo* and *Jessica*, on page 113, will show what we mean. It is not perfect, for here and there a word grates a little on the ear, or a cadence lacks its dying fall; but none the less there is something of Shakspeare in it that we have not found elsewhere.

It takes little from the praise due to M. Darmesteter to say that the reader notes some slips in his work here and there, as where he makes *Mark Antony* say in his speech, "Mais, si j'étais Brutus, un Brutus-Antoine, j'enlèverais vos âmes," etc.; or shows *Cleopatra* with the asp, her "baby at her breast," "tétant sa nourrice endormie"; or even when he mistakes the lilies in *Justice Shallow's* coat-of-arms for lilies. Nor does it matter much more to the wise reader if he cannot wholly go along with the author in his opinion of the "pure et chaste jeune fille" *Ophelia*, or if he believes that there was another and more deep-seated reason for *Iago's* hatred of *Othello* than mere jealousy of *Cassio's* advancement. These are but trifles; the main thing is, that a simple and excellent book on Shakspeare has been given to French readers by M. Darmesteter.

The print and paper of the volume are good, but not the best. The illustrations are all of them atrocious: those representing the witch-scene in "*Macbeth*," and *Prospero* and *Miranda* in the "*Tempest*," especially cry to heaven.

#### BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

- Anderson, Nellie V. *The Right Knock: A Story.* Chicago: The Author. 50 cents.  
 Bamford, Mary E. *Up and Down the Brooks.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 75 cents.  
 Bland, F. *The Prophet's Mantle.* Belford, Clarke & Co.  
 Booth, C. *Labor and Life of the People.* Vol. I. East London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

- Bowden, T. R. *Blunders in Educated Circles Corrected.* G. W. Dillingham.  
 Burnett, Frances Hodgson. *Vagabondia: A Love Story.* Chas. Scribner's Sons. 50 cents.  
 Burroughs, J. *Indoor Studies.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.25.  
 Clarke, W. *Political Orations, from Wentworth to Macaulay.* London: Walter Scott.  
 Cobb, S. Jr. *The Smuggler of King's Cove.* Cassell & Co. 50 cents.  
 Cook, Clarence. *Art and Artists of Our Time.* Parts 1-16. Selmar Hess.  
 Corbett, J. *Kophetia the Thirteenth.* Macmillan & Co. \$1.  
 Deland, Margaret. *John Ward, Preacher.* 37th thousand. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.  
 Desty, R. *Lawyer's Reports Annotated.* Book II. All Current Cases of General Value Decided in the United States, State, and Territorial Courts, with Full Annotation. Rochester: The Lawyer's Cooperative Publishing Co.  
 Eagan, M. F. *Lectures on English Literature.* W. H. Sadler.  
 Emerson, R. W. *The Fortune of the Republic, and Other American Addresses.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 15 cents.  
 Fiske, J. *The Beginnings of New England; or, the Puritan Theocracy in its Relations to Civil and Religious Liberty.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$2.  
 Gairdner, J. *Henry the Seventh.* Macmillan & Co. 60 cents.  
 Heimburg, W. *Two Daughters of One Race.* Illustrated. Worthington Co.  
 Heyne, Prof. M. *Deutsches Wörterbuch.* A-Ehe. B. Westermann & Co.  
 Johnson, W. E. *Treatise on Trigonometry.* Macmillan & Co. \$2.25.  
 Justl, Prof. C. *Diego Velazquez and his Times.* Translated by Prof. A. H. Keane. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. \$1.00.  
 Kellogg, Prof. M. *M. Tullii Cicero's Brutus de Claris Oratoribus.* Boston: Ginn & Co. \$1.35.  
 Kerr, A. M. *Trean; or, The Mormon's Daughter.* Belford, Clarke & Co.  
 King, Capt. C. *"Laramie"; or, The Queen of Bedlam. A Story of the Sioux War of 1876.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. \$1.  
 Lang, A. *Theocritus, Bion and Moschus. Rendered into English Prose, with an Introductory Essay.* Macmillan & Co. \$1.25.  
 Larnie, W. *Glanias, and Other Poems.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.  
 Lee, Margaret. *Lizzie Adriance.* George Munro. 25 cents.  
 Lyall, Edna. *Derrick Vaughn, Novelist.* Frank F. Lovell & Co.  
 MacCoun, T. *An Historical Geography of the United States.* The Author. \$1.  
 Mercer, Rev. A. G. *Christ and his Teachings. Sermons.* A. D. F. Randolph & Co. \$1.50.  
 Merriam, Florence A. *Birds through an Opera-Glass.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 75 cents.  
 Miss Kate; or, Confessions of a Caretaker. By "Rita." Frank F. Lovell & Co. 30 cents.  
 National Academy of Sciences. Vol. IV. *First Memoir. The Cave Fauna of North America, with Remarks on the Anatomy of the Brain and Origin of the Blind Species.* Smithsonian Institution.  
 Near to Happiness. Translated from the French by Frank H. Potter. D. Appleton & Co.  
 North, B. *The Diamond Button; Whose Was It? Cassell & Co. 60 cents.*  
 Ohnet, G. *Antoinette; the Maripit Mystery.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 50 cents.  
 Panorama of the Hudson. New York: Bryant Literary Union.  
 Pendleton, L. *In the Wire-Grass: A Novel.* D. Appleton & Co.  
 Pitman-Howard. *The Reporter's Companion.* Cincinnati: The Photographic Institute.  
 Putnam, Prof. D. *Elementary Psychology, or, First Principles of Mental and Moral Science, for Schools.* A. S. Barnes & Co. 90 cents.  
 Regel-Schuler. *Einführung in das heutige Englisch nach Stämmen geordnet, mit Berücksichtigung der Synonymik.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.  
 Robinson, W. *The English Flower Garden. Style, Position, and Arrangement.* Forming Vol. I. of the *Garden Cyclopædia.* Illustrated. 2d ed. London: John Murray.  
 Rosen, L. *Grisette: A Tale of Paris and New York.* John Day.  
 Rydberg, Dr. V. *Teutonic Mythology.* Translated from the Swedish by Rasmus B. Anderson. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.  
 Selby, F. G. *Bacon's Essays.* With Introduction and Notes. Macmillan & Co. 90 cents.  
 Shney, Lillian Hinman. *California Sunshine.* Oakland, Cal.: Pacific Press Publishing Co.  
 Sidgwick, Mrs. Alfred. *Caroline Schlegel and her Friends.* Scribner & Welford. \$2.  
 Simonds, W. E. *Sir Thomas Wyatt and his Poems.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 95 cents.  
 Super, Prof. O. B. *Le Mari de Madame de Solange.* Par Emile Souvestre. With English Notes. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.  
 Snyder, W. L. *The Geography of Marriage; or, Legal Perplexities of Wedlock in the United States.* G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.50.  
 Zarilla: A Novel. G. W. Dillingham. 50 cents.

## Our Native Ferns

AND THEIR ALLIES. By Lucien M. Underwood, Professor in Syracuse University. Third edition, revised. 12mo, 156 pp. \$1.25.

"The addition of the remaining vascular cryptogams greatly increases the value of the book, and makes it doubly useful to all who seek to study this class of plants."—*Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club.*

## Entomology for Beginners.

By A. S. Packard, M.D., Ph.D. 12mo, \$1.75.

"It is the best thing of the kind in the English, or any other language. There is no work that I would recommend to the young student so heartily."—S. W. Williston, Professor in Yale University.

HENRY HOLT & Co., New York.

## WANTED.

\$100,000

In sums of \$500 and upward, to loan on improved Denver real estate, at

8 PER CENT.

PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST GUARANTEED.

Denver real estate nets an average of 25 PER CENT. per annum. Maps and information free. Refer to Union Bank, German National Bank, State National Bank of Denver, Col., Chemical National Bank, and National Park Bank of New York.

MOORE & ERMERINS,

1026 Champa St., Denver, Col.,  
239 Broadway, New York.

## Bishop, Gorham & Van Kleeck.

EDWARD F. BISHOP, } DENVER,  
AUSTIN G. GORHAM, } COLO.  
HENRY VAN KLEECK. }

INVESTMENTS AND LOANS.  
Money loaned, interest collected, investments made and taken care of for Eastern investors in Colorado and the West.

References: Robert M. Morse, Jr., and Edward C. Perkins, Boston; James M. McLean, Pres. Man. Life Ins. Co., Amos Coting, New York, and the banks of Denver.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell Bills of Exchange on and make cable transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies, also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelling credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,  
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.  
NEW CATALOGUE of Books in good condition now ready. Books purchased.  
E. W. JOHNSON, 1336 Broadway.